5-6-1949

The Eucharistic Prayer- Its Use and Development

Henry C. Dequin
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_dequinh@csl.edu

THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYER -
ITS USE AND DEVELOPMENT

A thesis

presented to the faculty of

Concordia Theological Seminary

St. Louis, Missouri

by

Henry C. Dequin

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

of

Bachelor of Divinity

Approved by:

Walter E. Buszin

Alex Wm. C. Guebert

Concordia Theological Seminary
St. Louis, Missouri
May 6, 1949

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Jewish and New Testament Background 4

The Jewish Background 4

The New Testament Background 9

III. Pre-Nicene Developments 15

The Didache 16

Justin Martyr 18

The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus . . 22

The Element of Sacrifice 24

Analysis of Hippolytus 27

Discussion of the Anamnesis 33

IV. Post-Nicene Developments 37

The Prayer of Oblation of Sarapion . . . 37

The Apostolic Constitutions 52

The Liturgy of St. James 55

De Sacramentis 56

Cyril of Jerusalem 57

St. John Chrysostom 57

St. Augustine 58

The Liturgy of Addai and Mari 58

V. The Reformation and the Eucharistic Prayer . 61

VI. Consecration - Prayer, Words, Epiclesis . . 66

VII. Conclusion: Modern Lutheran Efforts to Re-instate the Eucharistic Prayer 68

Appendix 70

The Didache 70

Justin Martyr 71

The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus 72

The Prayer of Oblation of Bishop Sarapion . . 73

The Proposed Eucharistic Prayer of the 1948 Philadelphia Convention 75

Bibliography 76

THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

I. Introduction

For the past fifty years liturgical scholars have been exploring the history, background, and construction of the Eucharistic Prayer. Previously it had been taken pretty much for granted in all branches of Christendom. But with the reawakening of liturgical research the riches of the Eucharistic Prayer are being unearthed. In our own Lutheran circles the majority of the lay-people have never heard of the Eucharistic Prayer; and only a small minority of the clergy know that there is any such thing in the liturgy.

The Eucharistic Prayer was originally the chief and only prayer in the liturgy; it was "the heart of the liturgy."[1] It derives its name from the fact that Christ "gave thanks" when He instituted the Lord's Supper. Thus it is a prayer of thanksgiving at the celebration of the Blessed Sacrament which states the meaning of the eucharistic action, "Do this." "Since this prayer was originally 'the' prayer, the only prayer in the whole rite, it was there that the whole meaning of the rite had to be

---

1. Evelyn Underhill, Worship, p. 133.

stated, if it was to be put into words at all in the course of the service."[2] Dr. Pius Parsch, an Augustinian liturgiologist, calls it "the unchanging prayer for the consecration."[3]

Besides Eucharistic Prayer, or Prayer of Thanksgiving, it is known by other names. The Greek Church uses "Anaphora" (carrying or rising up). The Roman Church calls it the "Canon (rule) of the Mass."[4] The Anglican Church designates it as "Prayer of Consecration."[5] In the Lutheran Church it is known simply as "The Eucharistic Prayer." This latter name seems to be common to all, although there is much interchange of names between the Churches.[6]

Thus, we find the Eucharistic Prayer in all past and current liturgies. It always has the same basic form: it is preceded by the "eucharistic dialogue" ("Let us give thanks," etc.), and is usually cast in a Trinitarian mold. The first part is an ascription of praise to the Father (the Preface), the second to the Son (Anamnesis), and the third to the Holy Ghost (Epiclesis). At first it was one continuous and interrelated prayer; later the first and second parts were divided by the introduction of the Sanctus. That is how we know it today. In our Lutheran Liturgy the Preface is the only part which remains of the original three-fold division.

---

2. Dom Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, p. 156.
3. Pius Parsch, The Liturgy of the Mass, p. 185.
4. "The word 'Canon' is first found in a letter addressed to Gregory I (Ep. IX, 12), where also the expression Canon actionis is used." Ibid., p. 185.
5. The Anglican use will not be considered in this paper.
6. Minor names are: Prex, Praefatio, Actio; Immolatio (Gaul); Illatio (Spain); Contestatio - equivalent to the Roman Preface; used in the Merovingian liturgies and in the Bobbio Sacramentary. Cf. L. Duchesne, Christian Worship, its origin and evolution, pp. 213, 214.

A more general description of the individual parts of the Eucharistic Prayer is given by Dr. Luther D. Reed:

> The principal parts of the Eucharistic Prayer as found universally, though not everywhere in the same order, are: first, the Offertory or Oblation, in which the faithful brought their gifts to the altar with thanksgiving for the benefits of creation and redemption, and in many liturgies brought their self-offering in symbolic sacrifice with their gifts; second, the great Intercession which included supplications for every human necessity and intercessions for "the whole family of man"; third, the Anamnesis or "Remembrance," which grounds the entire action upon our Lord's command, "this do in remembrance of me," and recalls the incidents of our Lord's passion and the institution of the supper; fourth, the Epiclesis, or invocation of the Holy Spirit, whose power and blessing were sought for the worshipers as well as for their gifts. The Lord's Prayer immediately followed and led to the communion and reception.[7]

The Eucharistic Prayer was not always in this comprehensive form. It began simply. Subsequent developments brought about many changes and additions, and its use varied in different regions of the Christian Church. This use and development of the Eucharistic Prayer we shall trace, from its inception in the New Testament to its form in the sixth century, touching also on the developments in the Reformation era.

---

7. Luther D. Reed, The Lutheran Liturgy, p. 321.

II. Jewish and New Testament Background

In order to understand the significance of the Eucharistic Prayer, it is necessary to study the circumstances attending Christ's institution of the Eucharist. What did Christ do on that first Maundy Thursday? It is evident that the entire Supper[1] consisted of elements of Jewish life and ceremonial. There was nothing strange in the disciples and Christ meeting together for the Supper. Neither was there anything strange about Christ's taking bread and wine, blessing them or giving thanks, and distributing them to the disciples. These things were familiar to the disciples - - they had often met with Jesus to "break bread"; they had often seen Him bless the food according to customary Jewish ritual. Dix claims that the strange thing in Christ's action was that He took a common Jewish ceremonial and invested it with an entirely new and Christian meaning, adding the command to perpetuate this action in remembrance of Him.[2]

The background of the Eucharistic Prayer has been sought in the customary Jewish blessings (berakah) which were part of every meal.[3] In Old Testament practice nothing was eaten

---

1. The three views concerning the character of the Supper - - Passover, Kiddush, and Chaburah - are summarized in J.H. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy, pp. 2-4. W.O.E. Oesterley (The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, p. 167ff.), Gregory Dix (The Shape of the Liturgy, p. 50ff.), and F.L. Cirlot (The Early Eucharist, p. 14f.) hold the view that it was a Chaburah supper, a religious fellowship.
2. Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, p. 215.
3. Cf. Adolph Wismar, "The Common Service. Its Origin and Development," Pro Ecclesia Lutherana, II, p. 20f.

until it had been blessed.[4] This custom has continued to the present day. Even now the father of a Jewish family offers long and extended prayers of blessing before eating. A notable example is their home ceremonial on the evening before every Sabbath.

A Jew blessed or thanked God for the food; he didn't ask God to bless the food.[5] Blessing and giving thanks to God were synonymous to the Jews - - they blessed a thing by giving thanks to God.[6] And these blessings centered around God's mercies to Israel in creating them and all things and in delivering them from the bondage of Egypt. These two elements, Creation and Deliverance - - later, Redemption through Christ - - formed the basis of the Christian Eucharistic Prayer.

Opinions vary concerning the exact position and connection of Christ's action and words of blessing with the ceremony of the Passover. Stoeckhardt believes that the Institution took place after the entire Supper was completed, and that Christ used the remaining portions of bread and wine for the Sacrament.[7] Ylvisaker, however, includes the Institution of the Lord's Supper within the celebration of the Passover Supper itself.

> The sacrament was instituted, we believe, after the lamb had been eaten, while the second and larger portion of the broken bread was passed and the third cup was filled and emptied. With the breaking and the eating of the bread, Jesus joins the first, and with the drinking of the cup, the second part of the

---

4. Cf. I Samuel 9:13; Isaiah 62:9.
5. Felix L. Cirlot, The Early Eucharist, p. 14.
6. Dix, op. cit., p. 79.
7. G. Stoeckhardt, Die biblische Geschichte des Neuen Testaments, p. 266.

> sacrament. This cup was termed, as we have noted, the "cup of blessing," and Paul says in speaking of the sacrament: "The cup of blessing which we bless . . . " (I Cor. 10:16). The Lord has thus inserted the Holy Supper into the frame of the passover.[8]

Edersheim substantiates this view, stating:

> If we now ask ourselves at what part of the Paschal Supper the new Institution was made, we cannot doubt that it was before the Supper was completely ended . . . According to the Jewish ritual, the third cup was filled at the close of the Supper. This was called, as by St. Paul, 'the Cup of Blessing,' partly, because a special 'blessing' was pronounced over it. It is described as one of the ten essential rites in the Paschal Supper. . . But we can have little doubt, that the Institution of the Cup was in connection with this third 'Cup of Blessing.'[9]

Fahling gives the ancient Jewish prayers as the following:

> Jesus gave thanks to God and invoked a blessing upon the bread. The ancient Jewish prayer over the bread was: "Blessed be Thou, our God, King of the universe, who bringest forth bread out of the earth."[10]
>
> The distribution of the bread was followed by the taking and the blessing of the cup. The usual word of blessing spoken over the cup, as transmitted to us, was as follows: "Blessed is He who created the fruit of the vine."[11]

Dom Gregory Dix advocates the theory that the Last Supper was a Chaburah, a religious fellowship, apart from the Passover. He insists that the Eucharistic Prayer is definitely connected with the Jewish blessings.

> This survival of the special 'invitation' (Note: "Let us give thanks unto the Lord our God" and the response) which prefaced the Thanks-

---

8. Joh. Ylvisaker, The Gospels, p. 658. Cf. Wismar, op. cit., p. 21.
9. Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, p. 511.
10. Adam Fahling, The Life of Christ, p. 600.
11. Ibid., p. 602.

> giving of a chaburah, together with the name eucharistia, would in itself suffice to link the christian 'eucharistic prayer' over the 'cup of blessing' with the berakah over the 'cup of blessing' which closed the chaburah meal. And the case does not seem to be weakened when we look at the contents of the two prayers.[12]

Bickell and Probst have connected the Liturgy of the Faithful (which includes the Eucharistic Prayer) with the Paschal Supper:

> The actual supper (Paschal lamb, etc.) ended with the mixing and drinking of the third cup of wine, over which a prayer (Grace after the meal) was said. Then followed the institution of the Holy Eucharist ("after he had supper," Lk. xxii, 20; I Cor. xi, 25). The fourth cup was mixed, the hands were washed and the second part of the Hallel psalms (cxiii, 9-cxvii) was sung. Then followed the great Hallel (Ps. cxxxv.). Both Ps. cxvii and Ps. cxxxv have a response: "for his mercy endures for ever" to each verse. Ps. cxxxv, 2-3 praises God as the highest of all, 4-9 celebrate creation, 10-22 mention the benefits he showed to his people, 23-24 apparently another kind of salvation from trouble, v. 25 is: "he gives food to all flesh". Here our Lord instituted the Eucharist. The preceding verses, modified in a Christian sense, became the first part of the Eucharistic prayer, thanking God for redemption through Christ (v. 23-24). The doxology at the end of the Eucharistic prayer corresponds to v. 26.[13]

Christ's institution of the Eucharist quite definitely included a blessing, a Eucharistic (Thanksgiving) Prayer. But it is impossible to be more explicit, since nowhere are His actual words recorded. Nothing is told in the New Testament accounts, apart from the fact that Christ "gave thanks" or "blessed." Thus, when Christ took bread and wine and blessed them, He may have given thanks to God for the blessings of

---

12. Dix, op. cit., p. 80.
13. Bickell, Messe und Pascha, pp. 105-122; Probst, Liturgie des iv Jahrhunderts und deren Reform, pp. 6-16; Quoted in Adrian Fortescue, The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy, pp. 71-72.

Creation and Redemption, casting these ideas, however, entirely in a new covenant mold.

> What our Lord instituted was not a 'service', something said, but an action, something done - or rather the continuance of a traditional jewish action, but with a new meaning, to which he attached a consequence. The new meaning was that henceforward this action was to be done 'for the anamnesis of Me'; the consequence was that 'This is My Body' and 'This cup is the New Covenant in My Blood'. Apart from these statements, the formulae which Jesus had used at the last supper, the jewish grace before and after meals, had referred exclusively to the old meaning. Beyond these brief statements, both the new meaning of the action and the words in which to express it were left to the church to find for itself, and there was nothing to suggest that this was a process to be completed by the first christian generation.[14]

Some portions of Jewish ritual for blessing closely resemble words and ideas which were incorporated into the Eucharistic Prayer. One of these is the first part of the great Hallel or Hallelujah (Psalms 113, 114). The Hallel is closely allied with the well-known words of the universal Preface in the Eucharistic Prayer, "It is truly meet, right, and salutary that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee, O Lord . . . " This is the portion which is ascribed to the Father.

> Therefore it is our bounden duty to thank, praise, exalt, glorify, praise and celebrate Him who has done all these things for our fathers, and for us. He has led us out of bondage to freedom, out of misery to joy, out of mourning to rejoicing, out of darkness to great light, out of slavery to liberty. Therefore let us sing before Him a new song, Hallelujah.[15]

---

14. Dix, op. cit., p. 215.
15. F.E. Warren, The Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church, p. 200. Cf. Luther D. Reed, The Lutheran Liturgy, p. 310.

Another parallel is the correspondence between the Tenth Benediction and the portion of the Christian Eucharistic Prayer found in the Didache IX, 9 and later in the Prayer of Oblation of Bishop Sarapion.

> Benediction 10. Sound the great horn for our freedom; and lift up the ensign to gather our exiles from the four corners of the earth. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, that gatherest the outcasts of Israel.
>
> Didache IX, 9. As the broken bread was scattered upon the mountains, but was brought together and became one, so let Thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth in Thy kingdom . . . [16]

The New Testament Background.

Not much is known about the celebration of the Eucharist and the Eucharistic Prayer in the immediate post-Resurrection Christian Church. There is no information until later years, when the Apostles recorded Christ's action. We know that the Christian's life consisted of praise and glorification of God for Christ's Redemption and Resurrection. Thanksgiving filled their hearts, and thanksgiving filled their worship. Those charter members of Christ's Church had no liturgy as we know it today. But it would be only natural for them to take the closest thing out of their Jewish life and ceremony, the Hallel (and more general, the berakah - blessing), and join to it the celebration of the Eucharist and the Lord's Prayer.[17] For in the Hallel was exemplified the Jew's praise to God, his blessings and thanksgivings to God for all His benefits and mercies. The

---

16. A. Z. Idelsohn, Jewish Liturgy and its Development, p. 302.
17. Ferdinand Probst, Liturgie der drei ersten christliche Jahrhunderte, p. 29. Cf. Reed, op. cit., p. 310.

first Christians did not immediately discard all of their common Jewish inheritance - - instead they clothed the products of the ages in the new and richer finery of Christianity. The Eucharist was indeed the Christian song of praise.[18] Thus, the blessings which Christ had used were continued as a new Christian blessing, a Christian Eucharistic Prayer, at each celebration of the Lord's Supper.

Dix says the following concerning the early celebration of the Eucharist and the form of the Eucharistic Prayer:

> The connection - - if such there be - - between the jewish and christian thanksgiving is one of ideas and form only, not of phrasing. The berakah has been entirely re-written in terms of the New Covenant. It concentrates in a remarkable way on the work and Person of our Lord, even where, as by Hippolytus, it is addressed to the Father and not to the Son, as in Addai and Mari. The series is, in fact, in itself an anamnesis of Him, as our Lord had ordained.[19]

> First, the name 'eucharist', 'thanksgiving', governed the whole rite from beginning to end. Secondly, this expressed the old meaning with which our Lord Himself had 'done this' at the last supper. Thirdly, this was something carried over from the very roots of the eucharist in the chaburah supper into its new christian shape, by the retention of the dialogue of host and guests . . . as well as by the derivation of the eucharistic prayer from the jewish berakah (- 'thanksgiving'). Fourthly, this jewish berakah itself, traditional at the last supper and the primitive Jerusalem eucharist when this was still celebrated at the beginning and end of a meal, contained elements which looked beyond that mere thanksgiving for food which would soon come to seem quite inadequate as the fulness of the new christian meaning began to be understood.[20]

---

18. Ibid., p. 27.
19. Dix, op. cit., p. 217.
20. Ibid., p. 215.

None of the New Testament accounts gives any information concerning the method of celebrating the Eucharist or the contents of the Eucharistic Prayer. The early Christians probably did simply as Christ did and blessed God for the food in a typical Jewish blessing.[21] The Rev. Adolph Wismar, who has himself written a Eucharistic Prayer,[22] states that the only definite liturgy for the Sacrament in New Testament times was the thanksgiving - - a remembrance, proclaiming the Lord's death - - and that all else is only surmise. He claims that we don't even know whether the Words were recited verbatim.[23] This corresponds with Cirlot, who believes that the Words did not occupy the same place in the first century that they did later,[24] as seen in Justin, Hippolytus, and subsequent Eucharistic Prayers.

The earliest written accounts of the Lord's Supper are I Corinthians 11:23f. ("when he had given thanks") and I Corinthians 10:16 ("The cup of blessing which we bless"). So Paul knew of a Prayer of Thanksgiving, or Blessing. Paul explicitly states that he is not presenting his own interpretation of the Supper, but that which he "received of the Lord." His words imply "knowledge given through his intercourse with the Apostles and early church at Jerusalem," not to himself alone.[25]

The Synoptists also include a Thanksgiving in their accounts of the Institution. St. Matthew (26: 26-28) and St. Mark (14: 22-24) both use εὐλογήσας ("bless") over the

---

21. Cirlot, op. cit., p. 61.
22. Una Sancta, VII, 4, p. 8f.
23. Wismar, op. cit., p. 21.
24. Cirlot, op. cit., p. 63.
25. J. H. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy, p. 9.

bread and εὐχαριστήσας ("give thanks") over the cup, while St. Luke (22: 19-20) follows St. Paul in using εὐχαριστήσας over the bread alone. These words, "blessed" and "given thanks," are used interchangeably and synonymously in the New Testament for the Hebrew "berakah." All three forms have the same connotation. They "denote an act of praise or thanksgiving addressed to God for the food which they were about to partake. The description accords with Jewish forms of grace at meals."[26] The use of these words and phrases in the New Testament is strong evidence that Christians had a Prayer of Thanksgiving to God at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. If these blessings were not used, they surely would not have been mentioned. In the case of Paul, he is not only recounting our Lord's action on that night; but he is stating the practice of the church: "the cup of blessing which we bless" (I Corinthians 10:16) and "When thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?" (I Corinthians 14: 16).

The exact form of the Eucharistic Prayer is not given in the New Testament. Its inclusion in the celebration of the Sacrament may have been so natural that it was taken for granted by the Apostles, who had personally witnessed the Institution. There are, however, evidences of elements which may have been used in the Eucharistic Prayer at that time. The New Testament tells of a Prayer of Thanksgiving. This is attested in Luke 22: 19 and I Corinthians 11: 23 (Christ "gave thanks"); I Cor-

---

26. Ibid., p. 4.

inthians 14: 16 (quoted above); and I Timothy 2: 1 ("I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men.")

Mention is also made of prayers remembering Christ's death, which could be the basis for the Eucharistic Prayer and the Anamnesis (remembrance): Acts 2: 42; Luke 22: 19; and I Corinthians 11:23, 25, 26. The "shewing forth of the Lord's death till he come" in I Corinthians 11 is one of the outstanding features of Paul's account of the Lord's Supper. "Such a commemoration was in its very essence an act of thanksgiving, and thanksgiving is a feature alike of Jewish meals and their Christian counterpart. It was in fact a 'memorial' made before God and man."[27] Another outstanding feature in Paul's account is "his statement of Christ's command 'This do in remembrance of me' (or 'as my memorial')."[28]

Fortescue summarizes the whole content of the Eucharistic Prayer in the New Testament in the following words:

> The texts show, as we should in any case have foreseen, that this celebration followed exactly the lines of our Lord's action at the Last Supper. His command was to do this - - what he had just done. The repetition of the whole story of the institution, including the words, in I Cor. xi, 23-26 argues that the celebrant repeated those actions and said those words. We notice especially the idea of a thanksgiving prayer as part of the rite. In I Cor. xiv, 16 the Amen said by the people is an answer to "thy thanksgiving"; among the kinds of prayer demanded in I Tim. ii, 1 are thanksgivings. Since both our Lord and St. Paul insist on the idea that the Eucharist is a memory of Christ (Lk. xxii, 19), a shewing forth of the Lord's death (I Cor. xi, 24-26), we may conclude that the prayers contained a reference to this.[29]

---

27. Ibid., p. 10.
28. Ibid., p. 10.
29. Fortescue, op. cit., p. 6.

From this evidence we may conclude that there was some form of Eucharistic Prayer in the apostolic Church. The reason nothing more is said in the New Testament about the content of the Eucharistic Prayer is most probably because these elements were "clearly and unmistakably present and believed in to the mind of all."[30] The early Christians simply took the Old Testament elements of thanksgiving and life and Christianized them with New Testament meaning and fulfillment of the Old Covenant. Therefore, in the celebration of the Eucharist, the early Christians followed Christ's Institution and gave thanks for the blessings of Creation and Redemption in Christ. This was the Eucharistic Prayer.

At first there was a mingling of elements of the Old and New Covenant, writes Cirlot. But as the Church became more Gentilic, the original Jewish elements tended to become completely transformed, and distinctly New Testament portions would have been included.[31] So in our Liturgy today the Preface to the Sanctus "represents the Old Covenant," and "the Lord's Prayer and Verba introduce the New Testament material."[32] The Epiclesis, Invocation of the Holy Spirit, would even take its particular place as a logical sequence following upon the Resurrection and Ascension.[33]

---

30. Cirlot, op. cit., p. 63.
31. Ibid., p. 64.
32. Reed, op. cit., p. 310.
33. Cirlot, op. cit., p. 70.

III. Pre-Nicene Developments

The outline of the first century Eucharistic Prayer was continued in the second century. It voiced the living and joyful thanksgivings of the people to God for His wonders of Creation and Redemption through Christ. Out of this primitive thanksgiving (eucharistia) the early church also developed "the ritual custom of offering the gifts of bread and wine as an expression of thanksgiving for God's blessings."[1] This can be seen in the writings of Clement of Rome, about a.d. 95., and in Irenaeus, about a.d. 180.

Although all other portions of the liturgy were rigidly "fixed," the Eucharistic Prayer maintained its original "pliable" character. In the service the Prayer alone was changeable, since it was the celebrant's own special contribution to the Eucharist; and he could phrase it according to his own extemporaneous thoughts and ideas. Of course, there was a customary outline which the Prayer should follow. But within this outline each celebrant used the words and phrases of his own choosing. This, too, was dependent upon the conservatism and tastes of the congregation - - differences in race, culture, and theology of various groups would give rise to differences in the Eucharistic Prayer. This conservatism caused certain "ancient phrases and features" to continue to "comparatively late dates" - - it was the reason for the gradual and eventual fixing of the Eucharistic

---

1. J. H. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy, p. 188. Cf. Luther D. Reed, The Lutheran Liturgy, p. 317.

Prayer in the fourth century. But until that time "the traditional freedom of phrasing allowed to celebrants ensured a certain elasticity in the prayer at least until well after A.D. 350 in most places."[2]

The Didache.

The Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, is the earliest known source for liturgical information after the New Testament period. Discovered by Bryennios and published in 1883, it dates back to the early second century. Three chapters - - 9, 10, and 14 - - are concerned with the giving of thanks. Chapter 14 deals explicitly with the thanksgivings in the Sunday Eucharist, while it is not definite whether Chapters 9 and 10 refer to the Eucharist or the Agape.[3] In the opinion of some liturgical scholars the prayers in the Didache are only communion prayers or table prayers, but Parsch considers them the "oldest Canon."[4]

The Didache continues the conception of the apostolic church that the Lord's Supper was a Thanksgiving, εὐχαριστία, and gives directions for the form of the prayers of thanksgiving. Brilioth says that these prayers were probably used "in the Syrian church about the end of the first century."[5]

The whole question of the Didache's authenticity as a source of information on the Eucharistic Prayer revolves around the meaning of εὐχαριστία. The title of Chapter 9 is "The

---

2. Dom Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, p. 7.
3. For a discussion of this question see Dix, op. cit., p. 90ff. and Srawley, op. cit., pp. 18, 22-25.
4. Pius Parsch, The Liturgy of the Mass, p. 26.
5. Yngve Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic, p. 19.

Thanksgiving (Eucharist)." The author of the Didache could have used the word εὐχαριστία as an all-inclusive term for both parts of the thanksgiving, the cup and the bread.[6] Or he could have used it as a general thanksgiving and not necessarily of the Lord's Supper, since the Christian's life is filled with "eucharistic prayers" for all sorts of things. "The mere word eucharistia in an early Christian document does not at all establish that the subject concerned is 'the eucharist' in our sense."[7]

There is much similarity in the Didache with previous developments in the Eucharistic Prayer. It continues the note of joy and thanksgiving with which the apostolic church viewed the Sacrament: "Before all things we thank Thee that Thou art mighty"; "We thank Thee, holy Father, for Thy holy name."[8] This exemplifies the "gladness of heart" (Acts 2: 46) of the Christian life.

The Didache follows the prevailing practice of its day by modelling its prayers of thanksgiving after the Jewish prayers for blessing bread and wine and by casting them in a Christian setting. Thanking God for Creation and Redemption again stands out in this Eucharistic Prayer. In the Didache it is also "the assurance of participation in the Kingdom that calls forth the church's thanks and praise."[9]

There are amazing differences in this early manuscript from other contemporary writers. One immediately notices that the cup is blessed before the bread - - "this is unique in all

---

6. Sfawley, op. cit., p. 19.
7. Dix, op. cit., p. 92.
8. Didache, X.
9. Brilioth, op. cit., p. 20.

Christian literature."[10] Usually the bread is blessed first, and then the cup. This difference in the order of the prayers is not found anywhere else, either before the Didache or later. It may be justified because of the structure of St. Luke (22: 17-18),[11] or because St. Paul placed the blessing of the cup before the bread in I Corinthians 10: 16 - - "The cup of blessing which we bless . . . The bread which we break." Justin, almost a contemporary, has only a single prayer which embraces both elements.

Another striking difference is that the writer of the Didache omitted the Words of Institution. In fact, there is no reference at all to the Last Supper, or to the Body and Blood of Christ, or to His Passion. These were all common features in the later Eucharistic Prayers. A final difference is the omission of any mention of "sacrifice" or "the offering of gifts" which is found in Clement of Rome, about a.d. 95.[12] Chapter 14 of the Didache has a reference to "sacrifice", but this is very minor when compared with later Eucharistic Prayers.

Justin Martyr.

Another second century evidence for the Eucharistic Prayer is found in the writings of Justin Martyr, about a.d. 150. In his Apology I, and also incidentally in Chapter 41 of his Dialogue with Trypho, Justin describes the Eucharist as he knew it. His entire emphasis is on thanksgiving. Chapters 65 and 66 of the Apology refer to the Baptismal Eucharist, while Chapter 67

---

10. Adrian Fortescue, The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy, p. 10.
11. Srawley, op. cit., p. 22.
12. Ibid.

concerns the Sunday Eucharist. These chapters combine to form a complete picture of the Eucharist, which at this time had become separated from the Agape. The Dialogue tells us that "the Eucharist is a real sacrifice offered only by priests (116) and that it contained a prayer explicitly naming our Lord's passion and death (the Anamnesis: 41, 117)."[13]

From Justin's writings we see that at his time the original fixed theme of the Eucharistic Prayer is continued - - God's work in Creation and Redemption is commemorated. The Prayer is still extemporaneous - - the choice of words being the privilege of the celebrating bishop. The general idea and plan in Justin correspond to the Anaphora of the Eastern liturgies as it is in Apostolic Constitutions.[14]

Dix and Probst take a more conservative view of the evidence in Justin for the Eucharistic Prayer. They contend that Justin shows nothing more than that the Roman prayer in his day contained elements of Creation and Redemption, and that Justin does not mention any other elements in the Eucharistic Prayer. Dix also says that it is possible to recognize in Chapter 65 of the Apology an "opening address" and "Naming of God." He states that Chapters 65 and 67 are only brief summaries of the Eucharistic Prayer; Chapter 66 may or may not have reference to a prayer in an actual liturgy as Justin knew it; and that Chapter 41 of the Dialogue does not directly state that it refers to the Prayer, but its content expresses the meaning of the Eucharist and therefore is valuable.[15]

---

13. Fortescue, op. cit., p. 22.
14. Srawley, op. cit., p. 35.
15. Dix, op. cit., p. 223; Ferdinand Probst, Liturgie der drei ersten christliche Jahrhunderte, p. 100.

In accord with St. Paul, Justin connects the Eucharist with the Last Supper and our Lord's Institution. This, and also the joining of it to the preparatory "office of the Word," are"landmarks in the development of the rite." The Didache, as we have seen, omitted any reference to the Last Supper. Justin emphasizes the "giving of thanks" by Christ in regard to both the bread and the cup; but he omits other features which are present in the New Testament accounts. In the Didache there were two prayers, one for the cup and one for the bread. In Justin there is only one prayer which includes both elements. When he uses "prayer of the Word,"[16] Justin might well have been thinking of this "giving of thanks" by Christ at the Last Supper.[17] Justin also has a clear reference to bread and wine as the true Body and Blood of the Incarnate Christ. This food is hallowed by the giving of thanks.

> For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Savior, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His Word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh.[18]

One of the features of Justin's account is the attribution of certain functions to the Logos. These functions were later attributed to the Holy Ghost. In Justin this is representative of "an early phase of thought" which "appears to have been traditional at Alexandria."[19] There is a parallelism here in

---

16. Apology, I, 66.
17. Srawley, op. cit., pp. 33, 34, 38.
18. Apology, I, 66.
19. Srawley, op. cit., p. 33.

Justin's language "between the operative power of the Logos in the Incarnation and in the Eucharist."[20] But it is not necessarily an "express invocation of the Logos."[21] Justin's emphasis was on the "thanksgiving," as was mentioned before. Fortescue says that "Logos means, not the personal Word of God, but a word of power, an almighty command that causes effects above nature. This mighty word of God caused the Incarnation: in the same way the word of prayer that we have from Christ causes the consecration of the Eucharist."[22]

What is meant by "word of prayer" or "prayer of His word"? Some think it means the Epiclesis. But whether it is or is not an Epiclesis, it is definitely a prayer of thanksgiving - - by it the bread and wine are "made a Eucharist." It is also a definite prayer and not a mere statement: "This is my body, blood." "It seems most reasonable to understand it of the whole prayer of Consecration, the whole Anaphora which consecrates the gifts, which in the opinion of the Fathers of Justin's time was handed down entire by our Lord and his apostles."[23] The Words of Institution were also included in this Prayer as recorded by Justin. There are many parallels which can be drawn between Justin and the Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus, but these will be discussed in the next section.

---

20. Srawley, op. cit., p. 32.
21. Ibid., p. 33.
22. Fortescue, op. cit., p. 23.
23. Ibid., p. 24.

The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus.

Until now we have been discussing mostly vagaries, references, and allusions to the Eucharistic Prayer. With the beginning of the third century, however, our reconstruction of the development of the Eucharistic Prayer becomes more concrete. The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, dated about a.d. 215, gives us the first complete text of the Eucharistic Prayer. Developments at this time are not yet as complicated as in succeeding periods. Hippolytus' Prayer is the only one from the pre-Nicene era which has remained untouched by extensive later revision.

The author claims to be setting forth the traditional practice at Rome, which he knew as a youth. Therefore, its use probably began earlier than a.d. 215, being representative of the practice of the early Greek-speaking church at Rome. But "its subsequent influence is found almost exclusively in Egyptian and Syrian regions."[24]

Even though Hippolytus was a schismatic Roman bishop, his writing is accepted by liturgical scholars, including those of the Roman Church, as an authentic liturgy. Brilioth, however, says that Hippolytus "represents, not the type of congregational service commonly in use towards the end of the second century, but the work of an individual who deviated from the traditional form under the influence of a Pauline theology, and of a reaction against the Jewish elements in the liturgy, and thus took the passion and the atonement as his dominant ideas."[25] It is evident that certain parts of his Prayer were his own composition

---

24. Srawley, op. cit., p. 67.
25. Brilioth, op. cit., p. 26.

and represent his own peculiar theology of the Trinity, but the scheme and structure of the Prayer as a whole and even some of its wording were the tradition at Rome.[26]

When we look at the Prayer of Hippolytus as a whole, three things stand out - - it is Christo-centric, it is objective, it emphasizes Thanksgiving.[27] Hippolytus' Eucharistic Prayer is infused entirely with Christian meanings and revolves solely around Christ and the salvation which He earned for all men. All Jewish elements of thanksgiving are strikingly absent. As we have seen, these were the foundation for the Christian Thanksgivings. Ordinarily Eucharistic Prayers contain some reference to these Jewish forms of thanksgiving. In fact, the Prayer in Apostolic Constitutions VIII has a more than average dose of them. Justin also was acquainted with Eucharistic Prayers which contained these Jewish elements.[28] But Hippolytus does not have them nor does he refer to them. This omission is comparable to the tactics of Paul, who omitted things of Jewish life, knowledge, and custom, making his writings entirely Gentilic instead.

Hippolytus raises his Prayer above the ranks of the subjective and individual to that of the objective and dramatic. It concerns itself with Christ and His work and looks upward to God, not towards man and human elements. This, of course, is the purpose behind corporate Christian worship - - to subdue and surrender subjectivity and personal-mindedness when in the presence of God and our fellowmen. So here in Hippolytus everything is directed God-wards.

---

26. Dix, op. cit., p. 159.
27. For a discussion of these three points see Alexander B. MacDonald, Christian Worship in the Primitive Church, pp. 164-173.
28. See Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, chapter 41.

Also, Hippolytus emphasizes, as Justin did before him, the basic feature of the Eucharistic Prayer, Thanksgiving.[29] It is entirely "a prayer of Praise and Thanks. Confession of sin is absent."[30] We have mentioned before that the Christian life is preoccupied with thanksgiving. That is as it should be. Of course, we should have confession of sin, but this should precede thanksgiving. As we live more and more in the living and activating forgiveness of Christ, the more will our hearts, minds, voices, souls, bodies, and actions be filled and thrilled with thanks to God for His great mercies and salvation.

That brings us to the subject of "sacrifice" which has played an important part in the Eucharistic Prayer since the time of Hippolytus. From the Christian point of view, as evidenced in the New Testament, our lives should be a continual sacrifice, a continual giving to God of our praise and thanksgiving. The natural consequence of this is the giving of <u>ourselves</u> to God, and not only our prayers, praises, and thanksgivings. St. Paul says: "Present your bodies a living sacrifice to God."[31] All our life and being, all our actions and thinking, should be a eucharistic sacrifice to Him who has done so much for us.

At first, the element of sacrifice could have been accepted as only natural in the Eucharistic Prayer, but gradually, as forms became more static and liturgical manuscripts were preserved for posterity, we find it given a definite place in their

---

29. Brilioth, however, says that the note of thanksgiving in Hippolytus is subdued and does not "ring out in full clearness," because the Eucharistic Prayer is not connected with the "angel's song," the Sanctus, which he feels is the epitome of thanksgiving. <u>Op. cit.</u>, p. 21.

30. MacDonald, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 168.

31. Romans 12: 1.

chief prayer, the Eucharistic Prayer. The Didache does not say much about sacrifice. In Chapter 14 it only briefly mentions it: "Every Lord's day do ye gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanksgiving after having confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure." Already at the Didache's time, however, the idea of sacrifice was more elaborately dwelt upon by Clement of Rome, about a.d. 95, who mentions the "sacrifice" and "the offering of gifts."[32] Justin, some fifty years later, described the Eucharist as a real sacrifice offered only by priests.[33] Hippolytus developed the idea a little further and said: "We offer to Thee the bread and cup" and "We pray Thee that Thou wouldest send Thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation of Thy holy church."

But the idea of sacrifice did not always keep its originally pure and Scriptural meaning, as the act of the Church in response to Christ's command to "do." Under the influence of Roman doctrine it became perverted into a propitiatory sacrifice, a daily offering of Christ's Body and Blood for sins, which came to be known as "the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass."

> The Liturgy is more than a literary composition. It is a sacred action in response to our Lord's injunction, "This do." In the "enacted prayer" of the Liturgy the Church pleads the merits of Christ and His all-sufficient sacrifice and sums up with dramatic impressiveness all that we have in mind when we conclude our every prayer with the familiar words, "And this we ask for Jesus' sake." Here is corporate action which includes praise and thanksgiving, but embraces more than that - - an act, an offering, a sacrifice of faith, of obedience, of dedication. This sacrifice is in no sense propitiatory. It is commemorative, eucharistic, and

---

32. Srawley, op. cit., p. 22.
33. Dialogue with Trypho, 116.

> necessary for the realization of Christ's promises to His disciples of every time and clime. In the high solemnity of this corporate action, the Church proclaims before God and men its faith and obedience, and brings the Christ of Galilee and Calvary into the midst of the disciples of today. The substitution of mere edification for this sense of corporate action definitely weakens the Church's worship.[34]

Dr. Reed says there is also a "subjective, personal sacrifice" of ourselves in joyful thanksgiving in the concept of the Eucharist. It was the giving of self and also the presentation of the gifts, bread and wine, as part of their sacrifice. He states: "The thought of the early Church focused upon the offering of the gifts by the faithful in a great Prayer of Thanksgiving."[35] Reed also writes:

> We must bring more than bread and wine to the altar. We must offer ourselves in love and devotion, in self-denial and consecrated service, in an action which is the fruit and the proof of our faith . . . Unless we bring this self-oblation, this sacrifice of moral obedience and spiritual earnestness with all its ethical implications for daily living, we are weak and unprofitable servants, and the Holy Sacrament is for us a hollow mockery.[36]

Article 24 of the Apology of the Augsburg Confession ("Of the Mass") discusses quite extensively the element of sacrifice in the Mass. Among other things it says:

> We are not ignorant that the Mass is called by the Fathers a sacrifice; but they do not mean that the Mass confers grace ex opere operato, and that, when applied on behalf of others, it merits for them the remission of sins, of guilt and punishment. Where are such monstrous stories to be found in the Fathers? But they openly testify that they are speaking of thanksgiving. Accordingly they call it a eucharist. We have said above, however, that a eucharistic sacrifice does not merit reconciliation, but is made by those who have been reconciled, just as afflictions do

---

34. Luther D. Reed, The Lutheran Liturgy, pp. 227-228.
35. Ibid., p. 317.
36. Ibid., p. 228.

not merit reconciliation, but are eucharistic sacrifices when those who have been reconciled endure them.[37]

> The sacrifice (thank-offering or thanksgiving) also is added. For there are several ends for one object. After conscience encouraged by faith has perceived from what terrors it is freed, then indeed it fervently gives thanks for the benefit and passion of Christ, and uses the ceremony itself to the praise of God, in order by this obedience to show its gratitude; and testifies that it holds in high esteem the gifts of God. Thus the ceremony becomes a sacrifice of praise.
>
> And the Fathers, indeed, speak of a two-fold effect, of the comfort of consciences, and of thanksgiving, or praise. The former of these effects pertains to the nature (the right use) of the Sacrament; the latter pertains to the sacrifice. Of consolation Ambrose says: "Go to Him and be absolved, because He is the remission of sins. Do you ask who He is? Hear Him when He says, John 6, 35: I am the Bread of life; he that cometh to Me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst." This passage testifies that in the Sacrament the remission of sins is offered; it also testifies that this ought to be received by faith. Infinite testimonies to this effect are found in the Fathers, all of which the adversaries pervert to the opus operatum, and to a work to be applied on behalf of others; although the Fathers clearly require faith, and speak of the consolation belonging to every one, and not of the application.[38]

Let us now go into a discussion of the various parts of Hippolytus' Eucharistic Prayer. It was first preceded by the Eucharistic dialogue, known as the Sursum Corda ("Lift up your hearts," etc., "Let us give thanks unto the Lord," etc.), which from this time on was a characteristic introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer. Dix[39] has drawn up the structure of Hippolytus' Prayer as follows:

(a) Address: Relation of the Father to the Eternal Word.

---

37. "The Apology of the Augsburg Confession, Article 24, Concordia Triglotta, p. 407:66.
38. Ibid., pp. 409:74f.
39. Dix, op. cit., p. 158.

(b) Thanksgiving for Creation through the Word.
(c) Thanksgiving for the Incarnation of the Word.
(d) Thanksgiving for Redemption through the Passion of the Word.
(e) Statement of Christ's purpose in instituting the eucharist.
(f) Statement of His Institution of the Eucharist.
(g) Statement of His virtual command to repeat the action of (f) with a virtual promise of the result attaching to such repetition.
(h) Claim to the fulfillment of the promise in (g).
(i) Offering of the elements,
(j) constituting obedience to the command in (g), with an interpretation of the meaning understood by this obedience.
(k) Prayer for the effects of communion.
(l) Doxology.

The Prayer of Hippolytus contains nothing which would not have been accepted by Justin 65 years before. Therefore, there are parallels with the work of Justin, though all of them were not necessarily in the Eucharistic Prayer of Justin's day. The ideas concerning the meaning of the Eucharist were accepted and believed by the people, and gradually these ideas would become included in the Eucharistic Prayer which states the meaning of the Eucharist.[40] We shall point out these parallels as we come to them.

The opening part of Hippolytus' Eucharistic Prayer takes its cue from the preceding dialogue between the celebrant and people. It is addressed to the Father and runs as follows:

> (a) We render thanks unto Thee, O God, through Thy beloved Servant Jesus Christ, whom in the last times Thou didst send (to be) a Saviour and Redeemer and the Angel of Thy counsel; Who is Thy Word inseparable (from Thee).

This address has its parallel in Justin: "The president . . . gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through

---

40. Dix, op. cit., p. 224.

the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."[41]

The next three portions state the blessings which we have received from Christ, the Word of God, as our Redeemer and Savior - - Creation, the Incarnation, and Redemption through the Passion. These are the reasons for our thanksgivings.

> (b) through Whom Thou madest all things and in Whom Thou wast well-pleased;
> (c) Whom Thou didst send from heaven into the Virgin's womb, and Who conceived within her was made flesh, and demonstrated to be Thy Son, being born of Holy Spirit and a Virgin;
> (d) Who fulfilling Thy will and procuring for Thee an holy people, stretched forth His hands for suffering that He might release from sufferings them who have believed in Thee.

This section finds its counterpart in Justin when he tells why the Eucharist was instituted: "that we may at the same time thank God for having created the world, with all things therein, for the sake of man, and for delivering us from the evil in which we were, and for utterly overthrowing principalities and powers by Him who suffered according to His will."[42] In Hippolytus, however, the thanksgiving for Creation is only incidentally referred to,[43] while the chief object of praise and the greater emphasis is laid on Christ's conquest over death and hell. Thus, the eucharistic theme of the Prayer is unfolded and has a prominent place in Hippolytus. Paragraphs (c) and (d) of Hippolytus have a parallel in Chapter 66 of Justin's Apology.

In the second half of his Prayer Hippolytus was very careful in his articulation. The sequence of his form later became widely current in Eucharistic Prayers: the Narrative of

---

41. Apology, 65.
42. Dialogue with Trypho, 41.
43. Srawley, op. cit., p. 166.

the Institution, Anamnesis ("remembrance," "memorial"), oblation of the gifts, and the prayer for the benefits of communion in the communicants.

After the thanksgivings for Creation and Redemption in the first half of the Prayer, Hippolytus goes on to state Christ's purpose in instituting the Eucharist. This has no parallel in the writings of Justin.

> (e) Who when He was betrayed to voluntary suffering in order that He might abolish death and rend the bonds of the devil and tread down hell and enlighten the righteous and establish the ordinance and demonstrate the resurrection . . .

The exact meaning of this section has been questioned. What is meant by the phrase: "that He might abolish death"? Two meanings are possible. Christ went to His "voluntary suffering" in order that "He might abolish death." Or Hippolytus could mean that Christ instituted the Eucharist in order that "He might abolish death." From the grammatical point of view it could mean either. The first meaning seems the more natural to us. But Hippolytus could well have meant the other one. In other passages of his works he refers to the Sacrament as "the means whereby Christ intended to bestow on us these benefits of His passion. . . as the means by which Christ 'abolishes death' and 'rends the bonds of the devil' in the faithful communicant. It is a means of 'enlightenment' and a 'demonstration of the resurrection' (cf. John VI. 53-57). The institution at the last supper 'establishes an ordinance' - a phrase in itself difficult to interpret of the passion."[44]

---

44. Dix, op. cit., p. 160.

The next portion of the Prayer contains the Words of Institution and the Anamnesis.

> (f) taking bread (and) making eucharist to Thee, said: Take, eat; this is My Body, which is broken for you.
> Likewise also the cup, saying: This is My Blood which is shed for you.
> (g) When ye do this ye do My "anamnesis".
> (h) Now, therefore, doing the "anamnesis" of His death and resurrection
> (i) we offer to Thee the bread and cup
> (j) making eucharist to Thee because Thou hast made us worthy to stand before Thee and minister as priests to Thee.

The recital of the Words of Institution is also found in Justin. But here in Hippolytus they form the center, the pivot, of the whole Prayer. Thus, these Words are the climax of the Prayer - everything before leads up to them, and everything after receives its impetus or starting point from these Words.

In (g) the command and promise of the Eucharist justify the eucharistic action and meaning of the church. (g) also has a parallel in Justin: Christ said, "This do ye in remembrance of Me."

This eucharistic action and meaning of the church is then defined in the following portions (h), (i), and (j). First, there is the offering of the bread and the cup (h). This offering is a "priestly" action of the church and so is called a sacrifice (i). It is a sacrifice because its performance was commanded by our Lord as the remembrance (anamnesis), or memorial, of His death and resurrection.[45]

These three portions also have parallels in Justin. The offering of the bread and cup (h) corresponds with the Oblation

---

45. Dix, op. cit., p. 161.

of Fine Flour (a Figure of the Eucharist) in Chapter 41 of the Dialogue with Trypho. The sacrifice (1) was anticipated in Justin in the same work by: "He then speaks of those Gentiles, namely us, who in every place offer sacrifices to Him, i.e., the bread of the Eucharist, and also the cup of the Eucharist."[46] And the Anamnesis is found in Justin's Apology when "the president . . . offers thanks at considerable length for our being counted worthy to receive these things at His hands."[47]

The Invocation and Doxology then conclude the Prayer.

> (k) And we pray Thee that Thou wouldest send Thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation of Thy holy church (and that) Thou wouldest grant to all who partake to be made one, that they may be fulfilled with (the) Holy Spirit for the confirmation of (their) faith in truth;
> (l) that we may praise and glorify Thee through Thy Servant Jesus Christ through Whom honour and glory (be) unto Thee with (the) Holy Spirit in Thy holy church, now and for ever andworld without end.

Neither of these portions has a parallel in Justin. Comment on the Doxology is not necessary. But the Invocation (k) has been met with different views. Dix[48] rejects the phrase: "That Thou wouldest send Thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation of Thy holy church", stating that it was an addition of fourth century liturgists and not part of the original third century text. This view is upheld by pointing to the Testament of our Lord (fourth or fifth century, somewhere in Asia Minor), in which the words do not appear. The Testament incorporates much material from the Apostolic Tradition into its own text.

---

46. Dialogue with Trypho, 41.
47. Apology, I, 65.
48. Dix, op. cit., p. 158.

Srawley,[49] however, takes the opposite view and accepts the phrase of Invocation as authentic and supported by both the Latin and Ethiopic versions of the Prayer. He says the words do not mean what they mean in Greek forms, that is, that they are a petition for the conversion of the elements. Srawley gives it this meaning:

> The whole emphasis is on the action of the Holy Spirit on the minds and hearts of the faithful, "to bring God's people together in one", and "the oblation of holy Church", while it includes the gifts, would seem to suggest the whole action of the Church in offering. It is in fact a prayer for the communicants.[50]

We must now discuss briefly the meaning of ἀνάμνησις. This word appears in the New Testament only in the accounts of the Supper written by St. Luke[51] and St. Paul.[52] St. Matthew and St. Mark do not use it. In these accounts it means: "a remembering, recollection, to call me (affectionately) to remembrance."[53] The King James Version translates it "in remembrance of me." The use of this expression during pre-Nicene times in connection with the Eucharist is more common in Roman writers.[54] This may be the reason it is so strongly connected with the element of sacrifice. In some Eucharistic Prayers the Anamnesis became infused with the idea of sacrifice, an offering to God to propitiate for sins - - definitely a human doctrine added to the Eucharistic Prayer.

---

49. Srawley, op. cit., p. 70.
50. Ibid.
51. Luke 22: 19.
52. I Corinthians 11: 24,25.
53. Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, "Anamnesis", p. 40.
54. Dix, op. cit., p. 161.

Dom Dix says that the English translation of ἀνάμνησις as "remembrance" or "memorial" is inaccurate, because it has the connotation of something absent and only mentally collected. Dix summarizes his view in the following:

> It is in this active sense, therefore, of "re-calling" or "re-presenting" before God, the sacrifice of Christ, and thus making it here and now operative by its effects in the communicants, that the eucharist is regarded both by the New Testament and by the second century writers as the anamnesis of the passion, or of the passion and resurrection combined. It is for this reason that Justin and Hippolytus and later writers after them speak so directly and vividly of the eucharist in the present bestowing on the communicants those effects of redemption - - immortality, eternal life, forgiveness of sins, deliverance from the power of the devil and so on - - which we usually attribute more directly to the sacrifice of Christ viewed as a single historical event in the past. One has only to examine their unfamiliar language closely to recognize how completely they identify the offering of the eucharist by the church with the offering of Himself by our Lord, not by way of a repetition, but as a "re-presentation" (anamnesis) of the same offering by the church "which is His Body."[55]

The Anamnesis is a remembrance of Christ's sacrifice for ourselves, not before God. Thus, we proclaim, we show forth the Lord's death. We plead forgiveness for Christ's sake, and we confess our faith in that forgiveness. It is a remembrance of Christ's entire life - - incarnation, death, resurrection, and ascension. And this remembrance found a place in the Anamnesis of the Eucharistic Prayer.

The Formula of Concord calls this remembrance an "abiding memorial of His bitter suffering and death and all His benefits."[56] The Apology of the Augsburg Confession also has this to say:

---

55. Ibid., pp. 161-162.
56. "Formula of Concord, Thorough Declarations," VII, Concordia Triglotta, p. 987.

> To remember Christ is not the idle celebration of a show (not something that is accomplished only by some gestures and actions), or one instituted for the sake of example, as the memory of Hercules or Ulysses is celebrated in tragedies, but it is to remember the benefits of Christ and to receive them by faith, so as to be quickened by them.[57]

From our discussion of Hippolytus we see that there are three points which stand out in the Roman Eucharistic Prayer. The first is the central location of the Narrative of the Institution in the Prayer as the authority for what the church does in the Eucharist. This is placed out of its historical order, which would be after the thanksgiving for the passion. Secondly, they identify the Lord's Body and Blood by the institution with the offering and reception of the bread and the cup by the church. This is a "priestly" act on the part of the church - the "doing" - following our Lord's command. Third, the Eucharistic Prayer re-calls or re-presents the sacrifice of Christ in death and resurrection. And this re-calling is made present and operative by its effects in the communicants.[58]

This concludes the developments in the Eucharistic Prayer before the Council of Nicea, a.d. 325. Throughout the pre-Nicene era there was much diversity in worship and liturgy and particularly in the Eucharistic Prayer, the central prayer in the service. This was caused by the many persecutions of the Christians which scattered the Church and made more intimate contact impossible. However, after the Edict of Toleration in a.d. 313 and with the reign of Constantine as the first Christian

---

57. "The Apology of the Augsburg Confession," Article 24, Concordia Triglotta, p. 409.
58. Dix, op. cit., p. 162.

emperor, there was more physical union and communion between congregations and localities. Christian life and worship settled down. They could see how their neighbors conducted their worship and recited their Eucharistic Prayer. A gradual organization of life and worship led to more uniformity in liturgy and the Eucharistic Prayer. Therefore, our knowledge and insight into the development of the Eucharistic Prayer is greater and more concrete after Nicea. But we have thus noted that during pre-Nicene times the meaning of the Eucharist, as stated in the Eucharistic Prayers, was quite consistently the same.

IV. Post-Nicene Developments

Fourth century religious freedom brough about great changes. Compared with the minor references in the first three centuries, we now have "full information about liturgical matters in almost every detail."[1] As we have seen, there was much difference in the Eucharistic Prayer until now. This was the greatest difference in the rites of the various churches. Now, by continual adjustment and assimilation, these differences began to be "ironed out." Similarity and uniformity took the place of difference and individuality. "We can actually trace a number of verbal borrowings in the eucharistic prayer, by Egypt from Syria, and Syria from Egypt, and by Rome perhaps from both; and there is at least one instance of a reverse of influence from Rome upon the other two, directly or indirectly."[2]

The Prayer of Oblation of Bishop Sarapion.

The first major source of information for the Eucharistic Prayer in the post-Nicene era is the Prayer of Oblation of Sarapion. As Hippolytus represents the traditional Roman Eucharistic Prayer, Sarapion represents the traditional practice of Egypt. The manuscript of Sarapion contains a collection of liturgical prayers. An eleventh century manuscript ascribes the work to Sarapion, who was the bishop of Thmuis in the Nile

---

1. Adrian Fortescue, The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy, p. 76.
2. Dom Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, p. 8.

Delta from about a.d. 337 to a.d. 353 (360?). His prayers are dated about a.d. 350 or before. Before the uncovering of this Prayer the sources for reconstructing the liturgical development in Egypt were very meager.

Although the Prayer is undoubtedly Egyptian, there are difficulties concerning Sarapion's authorship. It is possible, though that the prayers are authentically Sarapion's. When compared with Eucharistic passages in third century Egyptian writers, an outline can be seen in Sarapion which is similar to that of his predecessors. This strongly indicates that the form in which we know Sarapion's Eucharistic Prayer is merely a revision of an older Egyptian prayer.[3] Some liturgical authors gain the impression from the Prayer of Sarapion that it is a composition and not representative of an "impersonal liturgical tradition."[4]

Throughout our discussion of Sarapion's Prayer of Oblation there will be many comparisons with preceding developments, especially in Hippolytus. Let us first, however, compare the entire Prayer with the Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus.

At first glance one immediately notices that Sarapion's Prayer is much longer than the Prayer of Hippolytus. There is much more elaboration; it is not as terse, direct, and precise as Hippolytus. This makes it difficult to see a definite berakah basis in the Prayer. Despite certain similarities in both prayers, Sarapion has lost touch with its original berakah type of Eucharistic Prayer much more than has Hippolytus. It

---

3. Dix, op. cit., p. 162.
4. Yngve Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic, p. 22.

illustrates one of the ways in which the basic theme of the Eucharistic Prayer, Creation and Redemption, came to be elaborated and expanded. (The Eucharistic Prayer of the Apostolic Constitutions illustrates another elaboration.) Such things as the Sanctus and the Intercessions have been added, causing the primitive outline to be obscured. The very marked differences of phrasing and arrangement in the central part of each prayer - - Sarapion (d)-(f) and Hippolytus (e)-(j) - - are evidence that there was no borrowing between the two during the development, even though these parts are concerned with the same subject.

Regardless of the differences between Sarapion and Hippolytus, there is outstanding agreement in their statements of the meaning of the Eucharistic action. We have already discussed these prominent points in the Roman Eucharistic Prayer.[5] 1) In both prayers the bread and the cup are said to be "offered" to God. In Hippolytus they are offered together, in Sarapion separately. 2) This "offering" is called by Sarapion a "sacrifice," by Hippolytus a "priestly" ministry - - both of which convey the same meaning. Sarapion calls the Eucharist "making the likeness of the death," instead of "the anamnesis (remembrance) of the passion," as it is in Justin and Hippolytus. 3) Sarapion also, as Hippolytus, centralizes the Narrative of the Institution in his Prayer as the basis for the church's effective "re-calling" before God of the sacrifice of Christ. However, this does not confuse the "re-calling" of Calvary to mean the "re-calling" of the Upper Room.[6]

---

5. See p. 35.
6. Dix, op. cit., p. 172 makes these comparisons between Sarapion and Hippolytus.

Sarapion's Prayer of Oblation begins with the Address to God. Sarapion's manuscript does not mention the Sursum Corda (the Eucharistic dialogue). But this is assumed since the Prayer begins, "It is meet and right."[7]

> (a) It is meet and right to praise, to hymn, to glorify Thee the uncreated Father of the only-begotten Jesus Christ. We praise Thee, O uncreated God, who art unsearchable, ineffable, incomprehensible by any created substance. We praise Thee who art known of Thy Son, the only-begotten, who through Him art spoken of and interpreted and made known to created nature (every created being). We praise Thee who knowest the Son and revealest to the saints the glories that are about Him: who art known of Thy begotten Word, and art brought to the sight and interpreted to the understanding of the saints.
>
> We praise Thee, O unseen Father, provider of immortality. Thou art the Fount of life, the Fount of light, the Fount of all grace and all truth, O lover of men, O lover of the poor, who reconcilest Thyself to all, and drawest all to Thyself through the advent of Thy beloved Son. We beseech Thee make us living men. Give us a Spirit of light, that "we may know Thee the True (God) and Him whom Thou didst send, (even) Jesus Christ." Give us Holy Spirit, that we may be able to tell forth and to enuntiate Thy unspeakable mysteries. May the Lord Jesus speak in us and Holy Spirit, and hymn Thee through us.

This address is concerned with the same subject as Hippolytus. But Hippolytus only states the relation of the Father to the Son, whereas Sarapion includes the Holy Ghost. It is thought that the first paragraph was either re-written or added entirely during the fourth century to the original third century text in order to refute the false teaching of Arius, which was being fought at that time, that the Son is a creature and does not know the essence of the Father.[8] Some expressions also have

---

7. J.H. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy, p. 52.
8. Dix, op. cit., p. 165.

a ring of familiarity with the Athanasian Creed. It, too, was written at the time of these Christological and Trinitarian Controversies to express the true doctrine. Such phrases in Sarapion as "O uncreated God" are reminiscent of "The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate, the Holy Ghost uncreate" in the Creed. Since Sarapion's Prayer was written about this time, it is strong evidence that it attempted to express the true doctrine of the Trinity in contrast to the teachings of the errorists.

In the Address we see a great elaboration on the very pronounced themes in Hippolytus of the creation, incarnation, and passion. Sarapion has developed these themes beyond the point of immediate recognition. The Creation theme is only referred to in "created nature (every created being)," while only the phrase "the advent of Thy beloved Son" brings out the Incarnation. There is no reference at all to the passion.

The Prayer continues with the Preface:

> (b) For Thou art "far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come." Beside Thee stand thousand thousands and myriad myriads of angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, powers: by Thee stand the two most honourable six-winged seraphim, with two wings covering the face, and with two the feet, and with two flying and crying holy, with whom receive also our cry of "holy" as we say: Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth, full is the heaven and the earth of Thy glory.

Here is the first mention of the Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer. It is a simple form and agrees with the original in Isaiah 6: 3 - - except for "<u>heaven and</u> earth." It is difficult to establish a definite date for the introduction of the Sanctus

into the Prayer. The earliest certain evidence can be traced in the writings of Origen at Alexandria where it is preceded by a Preface similar to Sarapion. "The simplest explanation . . . is that the use of the preface and sanctus in the eucharistic prayer began in the Alexandrian church at some time before A.D. 230, and from there spread first to other Egyptian churches, and ultimately all over christendom."[9] There is no Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus. This suggests that it was introduced later in some churches, "though it appears to have early attestation in the West from the Acts of Perpetua."[10]

With the introduction of the Sanctus the Eucharistic Prayer was broken into two parts, as we have it today. Thus, the Prayer of the Apostolic Constitutions is divided into two parts. The first deals with the commemoration of God's work in Creation and His dealing with man under the Old Covenant. The second part is concerned with the New Covenant, the Incarnation and Redemption of Christ. But during the fourth century, as seen in Apostolic Constitutions and in Sarapion, the Sanctus did not yet contain the Hosanna and Benedictus. These were added later, and are now found in most Eastern rites, in the Roman rite, and in the Lutheran rite.

There is a close similarity of Sarapion's Preface with that found in the later Liturgy of St. Mark, both Greek and Coptic. There are also the usual differences, however. The Preface from St. Mark follows:

> Thou art above every power, every dominion, every principality, every virtue, and every name that is named not only in this world but also in that which

---

9. Dix, op. cit., p. 165.
10. Srawley, op. cit., p. 195.

> is to come: for before thee stand thousand thousands and ten thousand times ten thousand armies of holy angels and archangels. Before thee stand thy two most honourable creatures, the cherubim, with many eyes, and seraphim with six wings, with twain thereof they cover their feet, with twain their faces, and with twain they do fly: and say, . . .

The similarity between this form and that in Sarapion quoted above can readily be seen. Sarapion, however, does not have the long intercessions for different estates of men, which precede the Preface in the Prayer of St. Mark.

A further correspondence between Sarapion and St, Mark lies in the portion following the Sanctus. Both take their cue from the word "full" in the Sanctus - - upon this word they build their theme. The use of the word "full" in this respect is characteristic of the Egyptian form, whereas the Syrian forms, (Apostolic Constitutions, St. James, and St. Basil) expand and emphasize the word "holy", continuing the thanksgiving: "Holy art thou . . . "

The next section of Sarapion's Prayer is for the acceptance of the "living sacrifice."

> (c) Full is the heaven, full also is the earth of Thy excellent glory. Lord of hosts (powers), fill also this sacrifice with Thy power and Thy participation: for to Thee have we offered this living sacrifice, this bloodless oblation (unbloody sacrifice).

This section contains a preliminary form of Invocation before the recital of the Institution: "fill also this sacrifice with Thy power and Thy participation." The main Invocation is usually after the Institution. This usage resembles that of St. Mark.

The meaning of the phrase "bloodless oblation (unbloody sacrifice)" has been the object of much speculation. Dix gives this explanation:

> The phrase "the unbloody sacrifice" is used by fourth century writers (first by Cyril of Jerusalem A.D. 348) to mean the specifically eucharistic offering of the consecrated bread and cup; and a prayer having a definite reference to the consecration of the bread and cup, at this point before the recital of the institution, is a peculiar characteristic of some later Egyptian eucharistic prayers.[11]

But Dix says that it is doubtful whether this is the original application of this section of Sarapion's Prayer. "This living sacrifice" could be connected with the phrase in the Address, "We beseech Thee make us living men." Then "this living sacrifice, this bloodless oblation (unbloody sacrifice)" would refer to the "sacrifice of praise" which is offered in the Sanctus - - it would not refer to the Eucharistic offering of bread and wine following. There are many references to this sacrifice of prayer and praise in other writers, such as The Testament of the XII Patriarchs and in Athenagoras.[12]

The Prayer continues with the Offering and recital of the Institution.

> (d) To Thee we have offered this bread the likeness of the Body of the Only-begotten. This bread is the likeness of the Holy Body, because the Lord Jesus Christ in the night in which He was betrayed took bread and broke and gave to His disciples, saying, "Take ye and eat, this is My Body, which is being broken for you for remission of sins." Wherefore we also making the likeness of the death have offered the bread, and beseech Thee through this sacrifice, be reconciled to all of us and be merciful, O God of Truth:
>
> And as this bread had been scattered on the top of the mountains and gathered together came to be

---

11. Dix, op. cit., p. 166.
12. Ibid.

one, so also gather Thy holy Church out of every nation and every country and every city and village and house and make one living Catholic Church.

We have offered also the cup, the likeness of the Blood, because the Lord Jesus Christ, taking a cup after supper, said to His own disciples, "Take ye, drink, this is the new covenant, which is My Blood, which is being shed for you for remission of sins." Wherefore we have also offered the cup, presenting a likeness of the blood.

The entire Narrative of the Institution in Sarapion is simple in character with only a few additions paralleled from later Egyptian rites. There is no mention of the basis of the Eucharistic Prayer, "He gave thanks," or of the Anamnesis, "This do in remembrance of me." Also, the form of the words over the cup is peculiar: "This is the new covenant, which is My Blood, which isnbeing shed for you for remission of sins." Another peculiarity is the addition between the institution of the bread and the cup of the phrase, "We beseech Thee through this sacrifice (sic !), be reconciled to all of us," with a prayer for gathering the Church into one, a distinct reference to the Didache, which we pointed out before.[13]

In this section of Sarapion's Prayer of Oblation there are certain elaborations and divergences from the much simpler form of Hippolytus. Sarapion combines the Narrative of the Institution with a statement of the purpose of the offering of the gifts. Hippolytus had kept these two elements apart -- the Anamnesis comes between the Institution and the Oblation. (In Sarapion there is no Anamnesis.) Thus, the recital of the Institution leads up to the Anamnesis and the Oblation in Hippolytus (as also in the Apostolic Constitutions), but in

---

13. Srawley, op. cit., pp. 54-55.

Sarapion the Institution is used to "justify the offering of the bread and the cup."[14] Both before and after the Institution there is a statement of the purpose and meaning of this offering. This emphasizes that the actual offering has already been made at the offertory. Hippolytus, however, keeps this in the background.[15]

Another difference between Sarapion and Hippolytus is the emphatic position of the Narrative of the Institution. In Hippolytus, as we have seen, this was centrally located as the pivot for the whole prayer, "as the supreme authority or justification for what the church does in the eucharist."[16] Sarapion emphasizes this authority even more clearly: "This bread is the likeness of the Holy Body, <u>because</u> the Lord Jesus . . . "

The explicit identification of the bread and the wine with Christ's Body and Blood in Sarapion's Prayer is a new element which is not found in the Eucharistic Prayer before the fourth century. Hippolytus contains an implicit identification in the Narrative of the Institution of the material elements with the Divine species by virtue of Christ's own promise. This is brought out in Sarapion by the words, "this is the new covenant, <u>which is</u> my Blood." The Gospel of St. Luke (22: 20) has "in my Blood." Hippolytus does not use the phrase at all, but his emphasis on the Narrative of the Institution is evident. This strange use in Sarapion likely "suggests that at one time the Hippolytan understanding of the force of the institution narrative prevailed in Egypt also."[17]

---

14. Srawley, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 54.
15. Dix, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 167.
16. <u>Ibid.</u>
17. <u>Ibid.</u>, pp. 167, 168.

The next part of Sarapion's Prayer of Oblation, the Prayer for Communion, is the main petition of the whole Eucharistic Prayer. It is divided into two parts: the means of communion, and the effects of communion.

> (e) O God of Truth, let Thy Holy Word come upon this bread, that the bread may become Body of the Word, and upon this cup that the cup may become Blood of the Truth;
> And make all who communicate to receive a medicine (literally, drug) of life for the healing of every sickness and for the strengthening of all advancement and virtue, not for condemnation, O God of Truth, and not for censure and reproach.

Liturgical scholars are quite agreed that this is an invocation of the Son, the Word, instead of the usual Epiclesis, the invocation of the Holy Ghost. This accords with Athanasius and the spirit of the Alexandrine tradition, as reflected in Clement and Origen, while fourth century Syrian sources for the Eucharistic Prayer contain a prayer for the operation of the Holy Ghost, not the Son. Sarapion's usage is a definite advance on Hippolytus' earlier Prayer. It "explicitly prays that the bread may become 'the body of the Word' and the cup the 'blood of the Truth'."[18] Dix has summed it up in the following:

> This introduction of a prayer for "the coming of the Lord," the Son, the Second Person of the Trinity, is a straightforward conception, which only makes explicit the ideas originally involved in the reference to the incarnation and in the institution narrative in earlier versions of the prayer. The implications of these references had already been made plain by writers like Justin in the second century. But the introduction of such a petition alters to some extent the balance of the prayer as a whole, by weakening the position of the institution narrative as the central pivot of the whole prayer.[19]

---

18. Srawley, op. cit., p. 55.
19. Dix, op. cit., p. 168.

Since this Invocation is a definite "consecratory" formula, the tendency of thought towards a "moment of consecration" in the Eucharistic Prayer can be seen. This was the second stage in the development of a "moment". The first stage was the acceptance of the Narrative of the Institution as the moment of consecration. This conception is still retained by the Roman Church, but the Roman Mass also contains the second stage of the development of the moment of consecration in the prayer Quam oblationem, which, however, receives only minor consideration. The Greek Church went on to a third stage which is not mentioned in the Roman Mass - - the prayer for sending the Holy Ghost, called the Epiclesis. It is believed that the Roman Mass at one time also had an Epiclesis to the Holy Ghost, a fragment of which is represented in the Supplices te rogamus.[20]

The second part of the Prayer for Communion concerns the effects of communion, spiritual and physical, soul and body. The corresponding portion of the Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus contains only a prayer for the spiritual effects of communion, although it appears that Hippolytus recognized also bodily effects; elsewhere in his Prayer he alludes to them. Thus, in his statement of Christ's purpose in instituting the Eucharist Hippolytus says: "in order that He might abolish death,"[21] merely a different way of stating the physical effects.[22] The Roman Canon, both in this portion of the Prayer and in the administration, refers exclusively to spiritual effects. Also the Anglican Prayer of Oblation speaks only of spiritual effects,

---

20. Fortescue, op. cit., pp. 405-406.
21. Cf. II Timothy 1: 10.
22. Dix, op. cit., p. 169.

but their words of administration mention also the bodily effects: "preserve thy body and soul." The Lutheran Liturgy contains only the spiritual effects of communion.

The next part is the Invocation.

> (f) For we have invoked Thee, the uncreated, through the Only-begotten in Holy Spirit.

Dix claims that this petition has its basis in the Jewish and primitive Christian traditions of "glorifying the Name of God" at the close of the blessings (berakah) or thanksgiving at the end of supper. This calling upon the Name of God, he says, is the reason the Prayer for Communion (e) is efficacious.[23]

Three Intercessions then follow the Invocation - - for the Living, for the Dead, and for the Offerers.

> For the Living:
> (g) Let this people receive mercy, let it be counted worthy of advancement, let angels be sent forth as companions to the people for bringing to naught of the evil one and for establishment of the Church.
>
> For the Dead:
> (h) We intercede also on behalf of all who have been laid to rest, whose memorial we are making (of whom also this is the "re-calling" (anamnesis).)
> After the recitation of the names: Sanctify these souls: for Thou knowest all. Sanctify all (souls) laid to rest in the Lord. And number them with all Thy holy powers, and give to them a place and a mansion in Thy kingdom.
>
> For the Offerers:
> (i) Receive also the thanksgiving (eucharist) of the people, and bless those who have offered the offerings and the thanksgivings, and grant health and soundness and cheerfulness and all advancement of soul and body to this whole people . . .

It is believed that these Intercessions are an addition to the original outline of Sarapion's Prayer.[24] When the Missa cate-

---

23. Dix, op. cit., p. 170.
24. Srawley, op. cit., pp. 56-57; Dix, op. cit., p. 170f.

chumenorum and Missa fidelium were celebrated separately, there were intercessions in each part. But after the fusion of the two Missae into a single related rite, the Prayer of the Faithful in the Missa catechumenorum was abbreviated, and even disappeared in some rites, in favor of the Intercession in the Eucharistic Prayer. The position taken in Sarapion for these intercessions is the usual one. Some liturgies, such as St. Mark, contain long intercessions in the first part of the Eucharistic Prayer. Others scatter intercessions throughout the Prayer - - exemplified by the Roman Mass which has an equal amount of intercessions before as after the Words of Institution. Sarapion's, however, is the first Eucharistic Prayer in which the recital of the names of the dead occurs.

> The chief points of interest in Sarapion's intercessions are: (h) The description of the eucharist as the anamnesis of the dead - - clearly in the same sense as at Rome of "re-calling" something before God. But the word is not applied to the eucharist as the anamnesis of the passion in Sarapion, though it is found in this sense in Origen in third century Egypt. In (i) the prayers for the offerers are of interest as the earliest Egyptian evidence for the custom of each communicant bringing his or her own prosphora for themselves. To be one of "the people" (laity), to offer the prosphora and to partake of communion, were still all virtually the same thing in Sarapion's time in Egypt, to judge by the way the petitions in (e), (g), and (i) repeat one another in their prayers for "advancement". In the later Alexandrian intercessions also, those for the dead immediately precede those for the "offerers".[25]

Sarapion's Eucharistic Prayer then closes with a Doxology:

> (j) Through the only-begotten Jesus Christ in Holy Spirit; (Response of congregation) as it was

---

25. Dix, op. cit., p. 172.

and is and shall be to generations of generations
and to all the ages of the ages. Amen.

The fact that the response: "As it was . . . " does not fit into Sarapion's Prayer either grammatically or in sense, leads to the conclusion that this was not the original ending of the Prayer. An older and more fully developed Doxology may have been included after the Invocation (f) before the addition of the Intercessions.[26]

The Prayer of Oblation of Bishop Sarapion reveals certain features which were more or less developed in Egyptian usage. 1) The general framework corresponds to later Egyptian Eucharistic Prayers. The simple form of the Sanctus is similar to St. Mark and omits the additions which are found in Syrian, Roman, and Byzantine forms. The Preface takes its cue from "full" instead of "holy" as in the Syrian forms. The Anamnesis also corresponds to the later Egyptian rite and differs from Syrian and Roman usage. "Thus the central portion of the Anaphora was acquiring during this period the character of a more or less stereotyped prayer."[27]

2) There are two forms of Invocation in Sarapion: before the recital of the Institution ("fill this sacrifice"), as in St. Mark, but undeveloped in character; and the Invocation that the elements may become the Body and Blood of Christ, which corresponds to the later fourth century manner. In Sarapion, however, the Logos, not the Holy Ghost, is invoked.

---

26. Ibid.
27. Srawley, op. cit., p. 65.

3) Sarapion is the first evidence for the recital of the names of the dead in the Eucharistic Prayer.

> The practice was probably an importation into the liturgy of his time, and that liturgy bears witness to an earlier condition of things, in which the prayers following the Invocation centred in the thought of the coming communion, while the prayers of a strictly intercessory character preceded the Anaphora. In this respect Sarapion, while preserving much that is old, witnesses to the new influences which were affecting the worship of the Church in Eastern Greek Christendom.[28]

4) The prayers which conclude Sarapion's Prayer of Oblation are similar in their general order to the scheme as it is in the Apostolic Constitutions and later Syrian and Egyptian forms.[29]

The Apostolic Constitutions.

The earliest Syrian evidence on the Eucharistic Prayer is found in the Apostolic Constitutions, Books II and VIII, called the Clementine Liturgy and dated in the fourth century. It is a compilation of various sources and various liturgies, such as Hippolytus, Chrysostom, the Liturgies of St. James and St. Basil. The author, however, has expanded them and clothed them in his own style of composition. Apostolic Constitutions, as also Sarapion's Prayer of Oblation, illustrates one of the ways in which the primitive theme of the Eucharistic Prayer - - commemoration of Creation and Redemption - - was elaborated. Although some liturgical scholars do not consider this writing as an official liturgy of a distinct Church,[30] it is valuable

---

28. Srawley, op. cit., p. 65.
29. For this entire discussion see Srawley, op. cit., pp. 64-66
30. L. Duchesne, Christian Worship, its origin and evolution, p. 56.

because it confirms and supplements the evidence of other Syrian writers in the fourth century.[31]

Book VIII contains more material than Book II for a reconstruction of the Eucharistic Prayer. By putting the two Books together, the main features of the Eucharistic Prayer in the Apostolic Constitutions can be seen.[32]

The Prayer begins with the Salutation and the Sursum Corda, derived from II Corinthians 12: 14. This usage, also in Cyril and Chrysostom, differs from the usual Dominus vobiscum. The Thanksgivings follow the traditional theme, commemorating "the majesty of God's being, the wonders of creation in nature and man, and the course of God's providence in human history and in His dealings with the chosen people, culminating in the description of the adoration of the angelic hosts, with reference to Dan. vii. 10 and Isaiah vi. 2,3."[33] Then the Sanctus is said. After the Sanctus the cue is taken from the word "holy" (also in St. Mark). The Redemption of man by Christ's Incarnation is then commemorated, the story of His ministry and suffering is told, and the account of the Institution concludes this section. A modified form of II Corinthians 11: 26 commemorates the Last Supper with the Words of Institution; the words are supposed to be said by Christ. In introducing the Narrative of the Institution, the author of the Apostolic Constitutions used the customary form in Eastern rites: "In the night in which He was delivered up." This section is more developed than the corre-

---

31. Srawley, op. cit., p. 88.
32. Ibid., pp. 90-101. Fortescue, op. cit., p. 61.
33. Srawley, op. cit., p. 93.

sponding form in the Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus and Sarapion. It also has some features which are not found in other rites either Eastern or Western.

The Anamnesis is similar to the Syrian and Byzantine type. It is introduced by the words: "remembering therefore"; the corresponding phrase in the Egyptian rite is: "proclaiming the death." The Anamnesis "commemorates the passion, death, resurrection, ascension, and return of Christ as judge of quick and dead, and contains an oblation of the bread and wine 'in accordance with His command'."[34]

The Invocation then "explicitly asks God to look favourably on the gifts lying before Him, and to send the Holy Spirit, 'the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus', upon the sacrifice, that He may shew the bread as the body of Christ and the cup as His blood, that those who receive them may be confirmed in godliness and receive remission of sins and attain eternal life."[35]

Both the Anamnesis and the Invocation in the Apostolic Constitutions have points of similarity with Hippolytus. However, the Invocation of Hippolytus expresses the benefits which the communicants obtain from receiving the consecrated gifts. The Invocation in the Apostolic Constitutions, on the other hand, "defines the effect of consecration upon the elements themselves"[36] and thus shows greater development than Hippolytus.

A long Intercession, including all kinds of people, follows the Anamnesis, having the general scheme used at Antioch. The

---

34. Srawley, op. cit., p. 95.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid., p. 96.

intercessions resemble the ideas, character, and phraseology in the deacon's litany of the Missa fidelium, with parallels in Chrysostom and the Eucharistic Prayer in the Liturgy of St. James. The conclusion is an ascription of praise.

When comparing the earlier Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus with the more elaborate form of the Apostolic Constitutions, there are very evident signs of development in the Eucharistic Prayer. The Invocation contains an express reference to the Body and Blood of Christ, in the manner of later Prayers. This feature was already expressed in Cyril of Jerusalem and the Prayer of Sarapion. The full scheme of intercessions following the consecration is another sign of development beyond Hippolytus.

The characteristic features of the Syrian rite are then: The Salutation (II Corinthians 13: 14); the cue after the Sanctus is taken from "holy" instead of the Egyptian practice of taking it from "full"; parallels in language and ideas with Chrysostom and the Liturgy of St. James - - this suggests the beginnings of a stereotyped form; and finally, the form of the Anamnesis corresponds with other Syrian sources and the Byzantine type.

The Liturgy of St. James.

Another prominent Eastern Eucharistic Prayer, the Liturgy of St. James, follows the main lines of the Apostolic Constitutions. But its construction plainly took place at Jerusalem. This rite was adopted at Antioch as the patriarchal rite, though it is not a pure descendant of the original rite used in the church of Antioch.

Except in Northwest Syria, the structure and framework of the Liturgy of St. James was used everywhere. The churches in Northwest Syria, however, exerted their individuality and produced about seventy Eucharistic Prayers as alternates for that of St. James. Dix writes:

> The general outline of these prayers follows that of S. James fairly closely as a rule. But some of them exhibit very interesting and probably ancient variations, and have been only roughly adapted to fit the S. James type; while even those prayers which follow it more closely are verbally independent compositions on the source theme rather than mere imitations.[37]

The Liturgy of St. Mark was also used in the Syrian churches. It is very similar to St. James and goes back to about the fifth century. Any differences between the two Eastern liturgies were probably made after the sixth century.[38]

De Sacramentis.

To complete the development of the fourth century, mention must be made of a few other sources. The De Sacramentis, ascribed to Ambrose, is important chiefly because it contains large portions of the present Roman Canon. In fact, the greatest agreement ranges "from the conclusion of the formulary of the diptychs up to and including the Epiclesis."[39] De Sacramentis is important also because it contains a prayer of intercession before the consecration and because it emphasizes heavily Christ's Words as effecting the consecration and changing the bread and wine into Body and Blood. The argument used

---

37. Dix, op. cit., p. 177.
38. K. N. Daniel, A Critical Study of Primitive Liturgies, p. 79. For a discussion of both St. James and St. Mark see Daniel
39. Duchesne, op. cit., p. 178.

is that everything else in the Eucharistic Prayer is the product of man, while the Words of Institution came directly from Christ. Therefore, they alone have the power of consecration. This is "an important point with regard to the Roman Epiklesis."[40]

Cyril of Jerusalem.

Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386) gives a description of the Eucharistic Prayer. It begins with the usual introductory dialogue, the Preface, and the Sanctus. The Invocation reveals that Cyril considered the operation of the Holy Ghost necessary for the consecration of the elements. Among the intercessions there are prayers for the dead which are justified on the ground that they will be beneficial to the departed souls while the sacrifice lies before the people. Cyril's description contains the earliest mention of offering intercessions after the Invocation.[41]

St. John Chrysostom.

In the various writings of Chrysostom (a.d. 370-398), who lived at Antioch, there are references to parts of the Eucharistic Prayer. Chrysostom mentions the Salutation based on II Corinthians 13: 14, the Sursum Corda and its response, the Preface, and the Thanksgiving. There are also allusions to

---

40. Fortescue, op. cit., p. 130. See also Srawley, op. cit., pp. 157-159 for a comparative table of De Sacramentis, and pp. 159-162 for a discussion. See Pius Parsch, The Liturgy of the Mass, pp. 198-211 for a parallel table of Apostolic Constitutions, Hippolytus, The Ambrosian Text, and the Roman Canon. The history of each part of the Roman Canon is found on pp. 345-351.

41. Srawley, op. cit., pp. 77-78.

the Words of Institution as perfecting the sacrifice, to the Invocation of the Holy Ghost to descend on the gifts, and to Intercessions for both living and dead. Chrysostom's basis for the intercessions for the dead is the same as Cyril's - - to benefit the dead souls while the sacrifice lies on the altar before the people.

St. Augustine.

St. Augustine also has many references to portions of the Eucharistic Prayer. From these the following scheme can be constructed: Salutation (Dominus vobiscum); Eucharistic Preface; Consecration of the Sacrifice; Fraction (ceremonial breaking of the bread in imitation of Christ's action); Lord's Prayer; Salutation (Pax vobiscum) and kiss of peace; blessing of the people with laying on of hands; Communion and communion psalm; final thanksgiving. There is no allusion to the Sanctus.[42] Augustine is also silent about the operation of the Holy Ghost in the liturgy, but says that the elements are consecrated by a "mystic prayer"[43] or "by the word of God."[44]

The Liturgy of Addai and Mari.

During the fifth century the East and the West separated. Each followed its own liturgical course. In the West there was a slight reversion to the previous individuality of local varieties, because the West was completely disintegrated locally.

---

42. Srawley, op. cit., p. 139.
43. de Trinitate, iii, 4.
44. Sermon 227.

The East, however, maintained the uniformity which it had accomplished, since it remained united under the political rule of the Byzantine empire. Eventually the rite of the political capitol, Byzantium (Constantinople), came to the fore over Alexandria and Antioch.

In Northeast Syria another rite was being used, the Liturgy of SS. Addai and Mari (a.d. 431), an interpolated form of the ancient use of the church of Edessa. It is a Jewish liturgy which has become clothed in Hellenic ideas.

> The Liturgy of Addai and Mari . . . is of interest and importance . . . because it is basically still a semitic liturgy, the only remaining specimen of its kind. It is cast in a different idiom of thought from that of the eucharistic prayers of the hellenistic christianity which had developed out of S. Paul's missions to the hellenistic world north and west of Syria. Its special importance lies in this - - that any agreement of ideas with these hellenistic prayers which may be found to underlie the marked peculiarities of SS. Addai and Mari helps to carry back the eucharistic tradition of the church as a whole behind the divergence of Greek and Western christianity generally from that oriental world to which the original Galilaean apostles had belonged. The obscure history of the Syrian liturgies has a special interest just because it illustrates that contrast between the whole mind and thought of the hellenic and semitic worlds which rarely meets us with any definiteness in christian history outside the pages of the New Testament.[45]

The interpolation of later additions in the Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari are: the main part of the Anaphora is addressed to the Son; the intercessions; and the form of the Invocation. In the latter there is much divergence of opinion. Srawley concludes that the Invocation in Addai and Mari follows that of Hippolytus in praying only for the benefits of communion to the people rather than the later form of praying for the Holy

---

45. Dix, op. cit., p. 178.

Ghost to bring about the consecration and change the elements into Body and Blood.[46]

One of the outstanding features of Addai and Mari is its omission of the Words of Institution. By this time the recital of the Institution had found almost a completely fixed place in the Eucharistic Prayer. But the only reference to the Words of Institution in Addai and Mari is the phrase "we . . . have received by tradition the example which is from Thee." Some liturgical authors believe that the Words were omitted from the written manuscripts of this Prayer, because the celebrant was expected to recite them from memory.[47] Despite the fact that their inclusion is not authorized in any manuscript,[48] Anglican editors have inserted just before the above phrase the Narrative of the Institution as it is in I Corinthians 11: 23-25.

This concludes the developments in the Eucharistic Prayer during the first centuries of the Christian era. The main points have been discussed, though by no means have we exhausted all the material. The churches of Eastern Christendom retained a multiplicity of forms. The Western Church, however, settled down to one uniform type, the Roman Canon, which today is almost identical in form as in the days of Gregory I at the end of the sixth century. No appreciable change has been made since that time. What the Lutherans did with the Eucharistic Prayer will be discussed in the next chapter.

---

46. Srawley, op. cit., p. 118.
47. Ibid., p. 119.
48. Fortescue, op. cit., p. 86.

V. The Reformation and the Eucharistic Prayer

To the Lutherans the Roman Canon was an "abomination." Luther especially attacked violently the errors of this abomination, for the Eucharistic Prayer of the sixteenth century was not what it had been in primitive Christianity. During the years it had lost its fundamental theme of thanksgiving for the wonders of God's Creation and Redemption in Christ. It had become so much infused with the element of sacrifice, oblation, offering, that it was now the sacrifice - - a daily offering of Christ's Body and Blood for the remission of sins. The Romans had lost the basic element, thanksgiving.

It was perfectly just of Luther to pronounce his disapproval on this corrupt doctrine of the Middle Ages, so thoroughly un-Christian. There is no other sacrifice for sins than the one Christ Himself made for us once and for all on the Cross. Luther repeated that cry over and over again. Many of his writings contain denunciations of the Sacrifice of the Mass. Chief among them is "The Abomination of the Mass" ("Vom Greuel der Messe"), which he wrote to stem the liturgical chaos of 1524.[1] Here Luther takes each prayer of the Canon and comments on it, denouncing everything that reeked of sacrifice. The writing is

---

1. Martin Luther, "Vom Greuel der Messe," Saemmtliche Schriften, XIX, pp. 1189-1215. The historical background for the writing is given by E. Reim, "The Liturgical Crisis in Wittenberg, 1524," Quartalschrift - Theological Quarterly, Vol. 45, No. 3, July, 1948, pp. 168-178; (reprinted in Concordia Theological Monthly, XX, 4, April, 1949, pp. 284ff.). The Works of Martin Luther (Philadelphia Edition), VI, pp. 124-131 presents only a translation of the Canon from the German alongside the Latin, but not Luther's comments on the prayers.

thoroughly in keeping with the outspoken, individualistic manner of Luther's personality. Whatever was contrary to the purity of the Gospel, Luther had no misgivings or compunctions in assailing; and he sometimes attacked these abuses in very strong terms.

At first Luther attempted to give an evangelical and spiritual interpretation to the words of the Canon. Failing in this, he proceeded to alter it. With one stroke Luther cut out the "abomination of the Mass." In the only two liturgies which have come from his pen, the Formula Missae and the Deutsche Messe, nothing remains of the primitive Eucharistic Prayer except the Preface (and the Sanctus) and the Words of Institution. Luther did this, at least in the case of the Formula Missae, to show "what in his judgment constituted an evangelical mass and what he was practicing in his own church in Wittenberg."[2] His aim was to remove doctrinal impurities and to feature Christ's Words, not those of man. To Luther the Words of Christ were all-important, as he says in his Treatise on the Babylonian Captivity of the Church:

> We must turn our eyes and hearts simply to the institution of Christ and to this alone, and set naught before us but the very word of Christ by which He instituted this sacrament, made it perfect, and committed it to us. For in that word, and in that word alone, reside the power, the nature, and the whole substance of the mass. All else is the work of man, added to the word of Christ; and the mass can be held and remain a mass just as well without it.[3]

This is similar to the argument expressed concerning the Words

---

2. Reim, op. cit., p. 172.
3. Martin Luther, "Treatise on the Babylonian Captivity of the Church," The Works of Martin Luther (Philadelphia Edition), II, p. 195. Cf. "Treatise on the New Testament", I, pp. 296, 297.

in De Sacramentis.[4] Thus Luther rid the liturgy of the hated idea of sacrifice and the offering of Christ, repeating again and again that Christ was offered once for the sins of the world and therefore cannot be offered again;[5] and he raised the Words to the supreme position.

Luther's action established a precedent. Subsequent Lutheran liturgies followed him in using only the Words of Institution and the Lord's Prayer. Although under this arrangement the Words of Christ stand out prominently and can express the Lutheran view of consecration, writes Dr. Luther D. Reed, the Lord's Prayer is not a valid substitute for the Eucharistic Prayer. Reed states that there are also strong disadvantages with this simple arrangement. It sets apart the Lutheran service from the universal practice of the Christian Church. It tends to a Roman interpretation of consecration, with its emphasis on the Words to effect the change. And it does not give due consideration and expression to the spirit of devotion which longs to surround Christ's Words in imitation of the primitive "giving of thanks," to "reveal the gratitude, love, sense of fellowship, and self-dedication" which these Words inspire.[6]

Although Luther[7] and the Lutheran Confessions[8] concede the idea of a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and even the eucharistic offering of ourselves to God, some of the element

---

4. Above, p. 56f.
5. "Vom Greuel der Messe," op. cit., pp. 1200, 1207.
6. Luther D. Reed, The Lutheran Liturgy, p. 333. This entire summary is taken from Reed, pp. 329-336.
7. "Treatise on the New Testament," op. cit., pp. 309-315. "Treatise on the Babylonian Captivity of the Church," op. cit., pp. 211-215.
8. "The Apology of the Augsburg Confession," Article XXIV, Concordia Triglotta, pp. 389ff.

of thanksgiving was lost from Lutheran liturgies. Often, only a shell remains of the former beauty and richness of the primitive Eucharistic Prayer. This tendency away from the original thanksgiving-basis for the Prayer was already begun in the Roman Canon by the infiltration of such strong emphasis on sacrifice, but it was carried still further by Luther's liturgical changes in his Masses. "Thus Thanksgiving had to make way for individualism and penitential gloom, and the eucharist lost a great part of its former glory."[9] Also, as Evelyn Underhill states, the Trinitarian balance of the Eucharistic Prayer was lost.[10]

The Rev. F. R. Webber says that the element of thanksgiving is thoroughly consistent with the Lutheran conception of the Lord's Supper.

> For those who look upon the Lord's Supper primarily as a seal of the forgiveness of sins, what is more appropriate than a great hymn of thanksgiving for this good gift? For those who stress the spiritual fellowship idea, as Luther did in his Treatise Concerning the Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ (1519 A.D.) . . . there is nothing that prevents them from looking upon all this as a great hymn of praise . . . But to the Roman Catholic and the Anglo-Catholic, with their stress upon their teaching that the Mass is the continual pleading of the Sacrifice of Calvary, and an offering anew of the Sacred Victim, then this theory that the Preface, Anamnesis and Epiclesis form a Trinitarian hymn of praise would be theological difficult, for it would imply a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, rather than a repetition of the Sacrifice of Calvary.[11]

Brilioth writes:

> Opposition to the idea of the sacrifice impelled Lutheranism to lay all the emphasis on the gift given to the individual in communion. The

---

9. Yngve Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic, p. 133. Cf. F.R. Webber, Studies in the Liturgy, pp. 164ff.
10. Evelyn Underhill, Worship, p. 280.
11. Webber, op. cit., p. 167f.

> gift to the individual came to be treated as the whole purpose of the service. The result was the individualistic outlook, which came to dominate the Lutheran view of the sacrament, and has ended, in many Lutheran churches, by driving out the eucharist from its place as the chief service. But the proper and primitive meaning of the eucharist is that it is the church's corporate act of praise, culminating in the eucharistic thanksgiving for the objective fact of redemption; and it is this which the Church of to-day and to-morrow must seek to recover.[12]

Of the many Lutheran liturgies which followed Luther only a few endeavored to reinstate some form of the Eucharistic Prayer. The first attempt was made by Anton Firm in Strassburg, 1523. Among them also is the Pfalz-Neuberg rite of 1543, which invokes the grace and blessing of Christ, similar to the Prayer of Sarapion. "Kaspar Kantz, in his revised Order of 1522, used a paraphrase of one of the prayers to introduce the Words of Institution. Oecolampadius, 1523, prepared a form of Canon which featured the self-oblation of the worshipers."[13] Other Lutheran Orders of Service contained a prayer of humble access for the communicants: Neuberg, 1525; Strassburg, 1525; Noerdlingen, 1538; Waldeck, 1556; Austria, 1571; Hesse, 1574. But none of them regained entirely the true spirit and expression of thanksgiving which fostered the initial and primitive Eucharistic Prayer.

---

12. For the text of this Eucharistic Prayer see Reed, op. cit., p. 635.
13. Ibid., p. 322.

VI. Consecration - Prayer, Words, Epiclesis

Throughout our discussion we have mentioned incidentally the various theories of consecration. Since this problem is important and extensive enough, it could constitute a separate paper. We shall, however, only briefly outline these three theories: the Prayer itself, the Words of Institution, and the Epiclesis.

The Prayer.

During the early years of the Church, the consecration was not narrowed down to a specific "moment." All that was considered necessary was to repeat our Lord's action as He had performed it. This they did by following the Jewish practice of blessing God for the food. It was believed that God would perform that which Christ had promised - - that bread would become Body and wine would become Blood. His Words were the authority for what was done. It was not even thought to be necessary to recite the Words, only to give thanks. Therefore, at this early time the Words did not occupy the prominent place which they did in later Eucharistic Prayers. By this practice the Holy Ghost could also be mentioned in the Prayer, though not as the power which changes the elements, but as a fundamental part of the Trinity and a natural consequence following upon Christ's Resurrection and Ascension. Therefore, during this time the Prayer

itself, the Thanksgiving, was considered consecratory.[1]

The Words of Institution.

The next theory of consecration is held by the Roman Church and the Lutheran Church, that the Words of Institution have the power of consecration. However, there is a difference even between these two Christian bodies. The Roman Church gives Christ's Words prominence because they are Christ's Words and not the contribution of the celebrating priest, and also because these Words effect the total change from bread and wine to the Body and Blood of Christ. Although Luther and the Lutherans emphasized the Words of Christ because they were the Words of Christ and not man's words, they also stressed that these Words are the proclamation of the Gospel, the promise of Christ. There is not, however, in the Lutheran conception, the absolute establishment of a specific "moment" when the elements become the Body and Blood - - emphasis on the Words was purely as the declaration of Christ's Testament.

The Epiclesis.

The third theory, held by the Eastern Church, is that the consecration is effected by the invocation of the Holy Ghost. This is the real meaning of Epiclesis, although it is sometimes used to refer to the Invocation of the Logos as performing the same function as the Holy Ghost. The Epiclesis was not used in the apostolic church, and does not come into the Eucharistic Prayer until about the fourth century.

---

1. See Underhill, op. cit., p. 136; Cirlot, op. cit., pp. 61ff.; Srawley, op. cit., pp. 196ff.; Dix, op. cit.; Daniel, op. cit., pp. 127ff.

VII. Conclusion: Modern Lutheran Efforts to Re-instate the Eucharistic Prayer

Recently within Lutheran circles there has been a movement to include a more extended Eucharistic Prayer in the Lutheran Liturgy. Some modern Lutheran liturgies contain some form of Eucharistic Prayer: the Bavarian Liturgy, 1879, used also by the Joint Synod of Ohio; the Russian Liturgy, 1898; the German Liturgy of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, 1855; and the Revised Liturgy of the Church of Sweden, 1942. Even the sectarian churches are finding a place for a Prayer of Thanksgiving.

Una Sancta, a magazine to stimulate and encourage liturgical personal devotions, published the earliest Eucharistic Prayer (the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus), the Roman Canon, and several contemporary Prayers, with a brief commentary on each of them.[1] Among them are the attempts made during the Reformation period, the modern Canon of the Lutheran Church in India, 1936, and those of the Rev. B. von Schenk, the Rev. Adolph Wismar of the Society of St. James, and two members of the Una Sancta staff. Most of these, except the Prayer of the Lutheran Church in India, have only parochial authority.

The article in Una Sancta concludes with several suggestions to follow in drawing up a form of the Eucharistic Prayer for use in the Lutheran rite: 1) It "should be phrased in good liturgical

---

1. A.C. Piepkorn and H.R. Kunkle, "The Eucharistic Prayer," Una Sancta, VII, 3, pp. 6-22; VII, 4, pp. 6-17. See also Luther D. Reed, The Lutheran Liturgy, pp. 317-337.

English"; 2) It must perform the functions of previous Eucharistic Prayers - - "verbalize the Eucharistic action, and voice our gratitude to God," and state the Church's meaning in the Eucharistic action of the Lord's Supper; and 3) It must be Scriptural and Confessional.

> It should be possible, as was done in the early Church, to provide a Eucharistic Prayer which would include the text of the Verba, and with it a devout meditation and commemoration offered to God as an act of worship. This would be a true prayer, and a confession of faith quite as is the Creed. It should be composed and should be understood as a Prayer of Thanksgiving and an act of self-dedication and not as a Prayer of Consecration of the elements in the usual sense. Our Lord has consecrated and ever will consecrate them. Our part is faith, obedience, thanksgiving.[2]

The most notable recent example of a Lutheran Eucharistic Prayer which promises wide acceptance among Lutheran bodies is that proposed at the 1948 Philadelphia Convention of the United Lutheran Church.[3] This is an effort to provide a Common Service for six Lutheran churches: American Lutheran Church, Augustana Lutheran Church, Evangelical Lutheran Church, Suomi Synod, United Evangelical Lutheran Church, and United Lutheran Church. The results of all these efforts remains to be seen.

---

2. Reed, op. cit., p. 335.
3. See The Lutheran, Vol. 30, No. 44, July 28, 1948, p. 16f. and Vol. 31, No. 4, October 27, 1948, pp. 12ff.

Appendix

The Didache[1]

Chapter IX. The Thanksgiving (Eucharist).

Now concerning the Thanksgiving (Eucharist), thus give thanks. First, concerning the cup: We thank thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant, which Thou madest known to us through Jesus Thy Servant; to Thee be the glory for ever. And concerning the broken bread: We thank Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou madest known to us through Jesus Thy Servant; to Thee be the glory for ever. Even as this broken bread was scattered over the hills, and was gathered together and became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom; for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever.

Chapter X. Prayer after Communion.

But after ye are filled, thus give thanks: We thank Thee, holy Father, for Thy holy name which Thou didst cause to tabernacle in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality, which Thou madest known to us through Jesus Thy Servant; to Thee be the glory for ever. Thou, Master almighty, didst create all things for Thy name's sake; Thou gavest food and drink to men for enjoyment, that they might give thanks to Thee; but to us Thou didst freely give spiritual food and drink and life eternal through Thy Servant. Before all things we thank Thee that Thou art mighty; to Thee be the glory for ever. Remember, Lord, Thy Church, to deliver it from the four winds, sanctified for Thy kingdom which Thou hast prepared for it; for Thine is the power and the glory for ever. Let grace come, and let this world pass away. Hosanna to the God (Son) of David! If any one is holy, let him come; if any one is not so, let him repent. Maranatha. Amen. But permit the prophets to make Thanksgiving as much as they desire.

Chapter XIV. Christian Assembly on the Lord's Day.

But every Lord's day do ye gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanksgiving after having confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice maynbe pure. But let no one that is at variance with his fellow come together with you, until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be profaned. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord: In every place and time offer to me a pure sacrifice; for I am a great King, saith the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations.

---

1. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, editors, Ante-Nicene Fathers, VII, pp. 379-380, 381.

Justin Martyr[2]

Apology I. Chapter 65. Administration of the Sacraments.

The president . . . gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at considerable length for our being counted worthy to receive these things at His hands.

Apology I. Chapter 66. Of the Eucharist.

And this food is called among us Εὐχαριστία (the Eucharist), of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that isffor the remission of sins, and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ has enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus delivered unto us that which was enjoined upon them; that Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, said, "This do ye in remembrance of Me, this is My body"; and that, after the same manner, having taken the cup, and given thanks, He said, "This is my blood."

Dialogue with Trypho. Chapter 41. The Oblation of Fine Flour was a Figure of the Eucharist.

"And the offering of fine flour, sirs," I said, "which was prescribed to be presented on behalf of those purified from leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, the celebration of which our Lord Jesus Christ prescribed, in remembrance of the suffering which Heeendured on behalf of those who are purified in soul from all iniquity, in order that we may at the same time thank God for having created the world, with all things therein, for the sake of man, and for delivering us from the evil in which we were, and for utterly overthrowing principalities and powers by Him who suffered according to His will . . . He then speaks of those Gentiles, namely us, who in every place offer sacrifices to Him, i.e., the bread of the Eucharist, and also the cup of the Eucharist.

---

2. Op. cit., I, pp. 185, 215.

The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus[3]

We render thanks unto Thee, O God, through Thy Beloved Servant Jesus Christ, Whom in the last times Thou didst send (to be) a Saviour and Redeemer and the Angel of Thy counsel; Who is Thy Word inseparable (from Thee); through Whom Thou madest all things and in Whom Thou wast well-pleased; Whom Thou didst send from heaven into the Virgin's womb, and Who conceived within her was made flesh, and demonstrated to be Thy Son, being born of Holy Spirit and a Virgin; Who fulfilling Thy will and procuring for Thee an holy people, stretched forth His hands for suffering (or for the passion) that He might release from sufferings them who have believed in Thee; Who when He was betrayed to voluntary suffering (or the passion) in order that He might abolish death and rend the bonds of the devil and tread down hell and enlighten the righteous and establish the ordinance and demonstrate the resurrection, taking bread (and) making eucharist to Thee, said: Take eat; this is MY Body, which is (or will be) broken for you. Likewise also the cup, saying: This is My Blood which is shed for you. When ye do this ye do (or make ye) My "anamnesis". Now, therefore, doing the "anamnesis" of His death and resurrection we offer to Thee the bread and cup making eucharist to Thee because Thou hast made us worthy to stand before Thee and minister as priests to Thee. And we pray Thee that(Thou wouldest send Thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation of Thy holy church) Thou wouldest grant to all who partake to be made one, that they may be fulfilled with (the) Holy Spirit for the confirmation of (their) faith in truth; that we may praise and glorify Thee through Thy Servant Jesus Christ through Whom honour and glory (be) unto Thee with (the Holy Spirit in Thy holy church, now and for ever and world without end.

R. Amen.

---

3. Dom Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, pp. 157-158.

The Prayer of Oblation of Bishop Sarapion[4]

It is meet and right to praise, to hymn, to glorify Thee the uncreated Father of the only-begotten Jesus Christ. We Praise Thee, O uncreated God, who art unsearchable, ineffable, incomprehensible by any created substance. We praise Thee who art known of Thy Son, the only-begotten, who through Him art spoken of and interpreted and made known to created nature. We praise Thee who knowest the Son and revealest to the saints the glories that are about Him: who art known of Thy begotten Word, and art brought to the sight and interpreted to the understanding of the saints. We praise Thee, O unseen Father, provider of immortality. Thou art the Fount of life, the Fount of light, the Fount of all grace and all truth, O lover of men, O lover of the poor, who reconcilest Thyself to all, and drawest all to Thyself through the advent of Thy beloved Son. We beseech Thee make us living men. Give us a Spirit of light, that "we may know Thee the True (God) and Him whom Thou didst send, (even) Jesus Christ." Give us Holy Spirit, that we may be able to tell forth and to enuntiate Thy unspeakable mysteries. May the Lord Jesus speak in us and Holy Spirit, and hymn Thee through us.

For Thou art "far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come." Beside Thee stand thousand thousands and myriad myriads of angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, powers (lit. rules, authorities): by Thee stand the two most honourable six-winged seraphim, with two wings covering the face, and with two the feet, and with two flying and crying holy, with whom receive also our cry of "holy" as we say: Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth, full is the heaven and the earth of Thy glory.

Full is the heaven, full also is the earth of Thy excellent glory. Lord of hosts (lit. powers), fill also this sacrifice with Thy power and Thy participation: for to Thee have we offered this living sacrifice, this bloodless oblation. To Thee we have offered this bread the likeness of the Body of the Only-begotten. This bread is the likeness of the Holy Body, because the Lord Jesus Christ in the night in which He was betrayed took bread and broke and gave to His disciples saying, "Take ye and eat, this is My Body, which is being broken for you for remission of sins." Wherefore we also making the likeness of the death have offered the bread, and beseech Thee through this sacrifice, be reconciled to all of us and be merciful, O God of Truth: and as this bread had been scattered on the top of the mountains and gathered together came to be one, so also gather Thy holy Church out of every nation and every country and every city and village and

---

4. L. Duchesne, Christian Worship, its origin and evolution, pp. 76-78.

The Prayer of Oblation of Bishop Sarapion (Continued).

house and make one living Catholic Church. We have offered also the cup, the likeness of the Blood, because the Lord Jesus Christ, taking a cup after supper, said to His own disciples, "Take ye, drink, this is the new covenant, which is My Blood, which is being shed for you for remission of sins." Wherefore we have also offered the cup, presenting a likeness of the Blood.

O God of Truth, let Thy Holy Word come upon this bread, that the bread may become Body of the Words, and upon this cup that the cup may become Blood of the Truth; and make all who communicate to receive a medicine of life for the healing of every sickness and for the strengthening of all advancement and virtue, not for condemnation, O God of Truth, and not for censure and reproach. For we have invoked Thee, the uncreated, through the Only-begotten in Holy Spirit.

Let this people receive mercy, let it be counted worthy of advancement, let angels be sent forth as companions to the people for bringing to naught of the evil one and for establishment of the Church.

We intercede also on behalf of all who have been laid to rest, whose memorial we are making.

<u>After the recitation of the names</u>: Sanctify these souls: for Thou knowest all. Sanctify all (souls) laid to rest in the Lord. And number them with all Thy holy powers, and give to them a place and a mansion in Thy kingdom.

Receive also the thanksgiving (eucharist) of the people, and bless those who have offered the offerings and the thanksgivings, and grant health and soundness and cheerfulness and all advancement of soul and body to this whole people through the only-begotten Jesus Christ in Holy Spirit; as it was and is and shall be to generations of generations and to all the ages of the ages. Amen.

The Proposed Eucharistic Prayer of the 1948 Philadelphia Convention[5]

The Preface and the Sanctus are the same as the Common Service.

Holy art Thou, O God, Master and Lover of Men, Thou and Thine Only-begotten Son, and Thy Holy Spirit, Holy art Thou and great is The Majesty of Thy Glory, Who didst so love the world as to give Thine Only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish, but have everlasting life;

Who, having come into the world and having fulfilled for us Thy Holy Will, and being obedient unto the end, in the night in which He was betrayed, took bread; and when He had given thanks, He brake it and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat; this is My Body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me.

After the same manner also, He took the cup, when He had supped, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; this cup is the New Testament in My Blood, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins; this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me.

Remembering, therefore, His salutary precept and all that He endured for us: His Passion and Death, His Resurrection and Ascension, His Intercession and Rule at Thy Right Hand, and the Promise of His glorious Coming again, we give thanks to Thee, O Lord God Almighty, not as we ought, but as we are able; and we make here before Thee the Memorial which Thy dear Son hath willed us to make.

And we beseech Thee mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and to bless and sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit these Thine own gifts of bread and wine, so that in very truth the bread which we break may be the communion of the Body of Christ, and the cup of blessing which we bless may be the communion of the Blood of Christ; so that we and all who partake thereof may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace, and, receiving the remission of our sins, be sanctified in soul and body and have our portion with all Thy saints who have been well-pleasing unto Thee; through the Same, Christ, our Lord, who taught us to pray and through Whom we make bold to say:

Our Father, Who art in heaven . . .

---

5. The Lutheran, Vol. 30, No. 44, July 28, 1948, p. 16f.

Bibliography

-------, "The Apology of the Augsburg Confession," Article XXIV, Concordia Triglotta, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1921.

-------, "The Didache," IX, X, XIV, Ante-Nicene Fathers, Authorized Edition, American Reprint of The Edinburgh Edition, Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, ed., Revised by A. Cleveland Coxe, Buffalo, The Christian Literature Company, c. 1886, VII.

-------, "Formula of Concord, Thorough Declarations," Article VII, Concordia Triglotta, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1921.

-------, The Lutheran, Vol. 30, No. 44 (July 28, 1948), and Vol. 31, No. 4 (October 27, 1948).

-------, Works of Martin Luther, Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, c. 1932, VI.

Brilioth, Yngve, Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic, A. G. Hebert, tr., London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1939.

Cirlot, Felix L., The Early Eucharist, London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1939.

Daniel, K. N., A Critical Study of Primitive Liturgies, (Travangcore, S. India), Kottayam, C. M. S. Press, 1937.

Dix, Dom Gregory, The Shape of the Liturgy, Westminster, Dacre Press, 1947.

Duchesne, L., Christian Worship, its origin and evolution, fifth edition, London, MacMillan and Company, 1931.

Edersheim, Alfred, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, 2 vols., New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1912.

Fahling, Adam, The Life of Christ, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, c. 1936.

Fortescue, Adrian, The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy, second edition, New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1937.

Idelsohn, A. Z., Jewish Liturgy and its Development, New York, Henry Holt and Company, c. 1932.

Justin Martyr, "Dialogue with Trypho," Chapter XLI, Ante-Nicene Fathers, Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, ed., Authorized Edition, American Reprint of The Edinburgh Edition, Revised by A. Cleveland Coxe, Buffalo, The Christian Literature Company, c. 1885, I.

Justin Martyr, "The First Apology," Chapters LXV, LXVI, LXVII, Ante-Nicene Fathers, Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, ed., Revised by A. Cleveland Coxe, Authorized Edition, American Reprint of The Edinburgh Edition, Buffalo, The Christian Literature Company, c. 1885, I.

Luther, Martin, "Treatise on the Babylonian Captivity of the Church," Works of Martin Luther (Philadelphia Edition), Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, c. 1915, II, pp. 170-293.

Luther, Martin, "Treatise on the New Testament," Works of Martin Luther (Philadelphia Edition), Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, c. 1915, I, pp. 294-326.

Luther, Martin, "Von dem Greuel der Stillmesse, so man den Canon nennt" (1524), Saemmtliche Schriften, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1907, XIX, pp. 1189-1215.

MacDonald, Alexander B., Christian Worship in the Primitive Church, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1934.

Parsch, Dr. Pius, The Liturgy of the Mass, the Reverend Frederic C. Eckhoff, tr., thirteenth edition, 1947, St. Louis, B. Herder and Company, c. 1936.

Piepkorn, A. C., and Kunkle, H. R., "The Eucharistic Prayer," Una Sancta, VII, 3 and 4.

Probst, Ferdinand, Liturgie der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte, Tuebingen, H. Laupp, 1870.

Reed, Luther D., The Lutheran Liturgy, Philadelphia, Mihlenberg Press, 1947.

Reim, E., "The Liturgical Crisis in Wittenberg, 1524," Quartalschrift - Theological Quarterly, Vol. 45, No. 3 (July, 1948), pp. 168-178.

Srawley, J. H., The Early History of the Liturgy, second edition, Cambridge, The University Press, 1947.

Stoeckhardt, G., Die biblische Geschichte des Neuen Testaments, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1898.

Underhill, Evelyn, Worship, New York, Harper and Brothers, c. 1937.

Warren, F. E., The Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church, second edition, New York, Gorham, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1912.

Webber, F. R., Studies in the Liturgy, Erie, Pennsylvania, Ashby Printing Company, 1938.

Wismar, Adolph, "The Common Service. Its Origin and Development," Pro Ecclesia Lutherana, II, pp. 11-42.

Ylvisaker, Joh., The Gospels, Minneapolis, Augsburg Publishing House, 1932.